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Abstract

The long-standing debate over the value of literature in the teaching of L2 academic writing has been ongoing. Given the general discomfort with the use of literature in source-based writing and in EAP writing instruction and the absence of literary texts in EAP writing courses, studies that look at how source texts are used in L2 writers’ acquisition of academic literacy skills are rare. Operating in response to that debate, this study sought to explore how three undergraduate multilingual academic writers negotiated the specific academic discursive practice of using both literary and nonliterary texts to complete source-based writing tasks. In doing so, the overarching goal of this study was to explore the use of literature within the context of teaching source-based writing in an EAP writing course.

Theoretical formulations drawn from Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory of mediation as extended by Lantolf (2000) formed the core framework of analysis for the study. Using qualitative methods of data gathering such as, participant observation, interviews, and document analysis, the primary sources of data examined were personal journals, course artifacts, questionnaires, interview transcripts, and field notes.

The study sheds light on the complexities involved in learning multifaceted academic discursive practices such as source-based writing. The findings suggest that although the participants encountered some discursive challenges in the practice of using sources, they negotiated the practice of source-based writing in individually nuanced
ways by adopting an agentive approach to employing mediating semiotic resources in their social context. A substantive new finding was related to how the use of a literary text has the potential to enhance and encourage the participant’s creativity in the composition of their own texts. This finding could be characterized as a grounded theoretical hypothesis and was evident in the ways that elements of creativity were embedded in their composed texts. Ultimately, then, the study has contributed new knowledge to the ongoing debate about the use of literary texts in research-based EAP writing instruction.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Within higher education settings, and in particular, within a U.S. university, novice multilingual students entering university are often expected to be equipped with literacy practices that are already an established part of academic discourse and which include the knowledge of linguistic, social and cultural features of academic discourse used by specific academic disciplines (Lea, 1998). Since the conventions of academic writing vary from discipline to discipline and depend on specific academic contexts, it is not surprising that novice writers, especially those working in a second language, struggle to acquire the knowledge and skills associated with it. Additionally, there are many factors involved in the construction of an academic text; students need to know the audience they are writing for, the discipline in which they are writing, and the purpose of the text, to name a few of the challenges they face (Paltridge, 2001). “The writer has to negotiate, through the construction of the text, his or her own view of these elements of writing with the views held by the readers” (Silva & Matsuda, 2002 p.253).

Consequently, academic writers have to learn new ways of creating texts to keep up with the rules of the discourse community they engage with.

Within a second language (L2) context, one of the biggest challenges novice multilingual writers face is composing their own texts using source texts, a skill set that
represents an important stage in the development of academic writing competency for L2 writers (as well native language, i.e., L1, writers). Quite a few studies have provided evidence to show that international students at Anglophone universities struggle with reorganizing data from multiple sources in ways that are appropriate to the assigned task (Dovey, 2010; Johns, 1985b, 1986; Shi, 2006; Swales, 1982; Wette, 2010). The integration of source texts into writing represents an important facet of academic literacy, and the lack thereof portrays or suggests incompetence. Research into the nature of academic tasks shows that writing research papers, which includes integrating perspectives from various sources to compose and support an argument, may be one of the many tasks undergraduate writers are assigned to do in their coursework across disciplines (Braine, 1995; Horowitz, 1986). Integrating and synthesizing various sources is a vital skill L2 writers need to demonstrate to be competent members of a discourse community. Novice multilingual writers may struggle with this form of ‘appropriating and representing social discourses’ (Bakhtin, 1986) not only due to cultural differences, but also perhaps due to the fact that many of them may not know the purpose of a source text and how to use it as a source of evidence to support their claims. Therefore, the question that arises is: how do we as composition instructors introduce second language writers to this complex and elusive genre of academic writing?

Some researchers have highlighted the significance of the reading-writing relationship to teach academic writing (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Carson & Leki, 1993; Ferris & Hedgecock, 1998; Nelson, 1998; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). Reading-writing connection studies view the relationship between reading and writing and the influence of
each skill in the development of the other. Carson and Leki (1993) documented the complex link between reading and writing abilities and the “extent to which reading can be, and in academic settings nearly always, is the basis for writing” (p.1). Furthermore, Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) emphasized the value of exposing L2 learners to reading in the target language and argued that reading would assist learners with a solid foundation of linguistic and rhetorical constructions in the second language.

Moreover, quite a few educational scholars in the field of L2 have advocated connecting reading and writing through literature and have supported the use of literature in the L2 writing classroom (e.g. Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Blanton, 1994; Gadjusek and van Dommelen, 1993; Hirvela, 1990, 1997, 2001; Vandrick, 1996). Hirvela (2001) makes the argument for the connection of reading and writing through literature and proposes linking reading and writing through the reader-response theory which highlights the role of the reader in determining the meaning of the text (Hirvela, 2004). He argues, that the advantages of using reader-response perspectives in an L2 writing classroom are numerous in that this approach not only positions L2 writers as legitimate participants in the meaning-making process, but also values students native language rhetorical and cultural backgrounds that shape their thinking process. In supporting the usefulness of using literature to teach L2 writing, Hirvela (2004 p.157) asserts:

The richness of literary texts (in terms of language, content, and rhetorical schemata) can make student’s tasks more meaningful and thus motivate students because the stories at the heart of literature-with their plot twists, important moments or events, and interesting or appealing characters- lend themselves to written and/or oral discussion in ways other texts might not
In alignment with Hirvela, Spack (1985) recognizes the value of literature in an L2 writing classroom through reader responses to the text and asserts that students reading and writing in literature learn “to make inferences, to formulate their own ideas, and to look closely at a text for evidence to support generalizations” (p.721).

Despite the above-cited calls for the use of literary texts in L2 writing instruction, it appears that literature plays at best a very small role in such instruction. In the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) context that constitutes the most dominant mode of L2 academic writing instruction, the nature of source texts used in academic writing courses typically consists of information-based texts/expository texts such as newspaper articles, magazine articles, editorials and other print or internet-based sources of a nonliterary nature. Such texts expose students to a diverse constellation of ways in which information is presented: opinions, examples, categorization, problem-solution, cause-effect and other sequential structures to inform and/or persuade the reader. In the eyes of most L2 academic writing specialists, this kind of exposure is not only sufficient for L2 student writers, but also accurately represents the kinds of texts and information they are most likely to encounter as the read and write across the university curriculum. Hence, they see no need to move into the domain of literary texts as well.

However, as L2 writing specialists have developed courses and approaches to writing instruction geared toward helping L2 writers acquire the academic literacy skills they require, some, as shown earlier, have advocated for the inclusion of literary texts in the teaching of source-based writing in the belief that exposure to such texts would be both fulfilling and valuable for novice L2 writers (Hirvela, 2004). However, this call to
include literature has not been accepted due to the fact that many L2 writing specialists believe that such texts may be too complicated for multilingual writers to comprehend. Moreover, these texts are not generally used for academic writing purposes (see Hirvela, 1990, 2001, 2004; Hirvela & Belcher, 2000 for reviews of the debate over the use of literature in academic writing instruction).

In short, there is a long-standing debate over the value of literature in the teaching of L2 academic writing. Operating in response to that debate, this study sought to explore how novice multilingual academic writers negotiated the specific academic discursive practice of using both literary and nonliterary texts to complete source-based writing tasks. In doing so, the overarching goal of this study was to explore the use of literature within the context of teaching source-based writing in an EAP writing course.

Statement of the Problem

In the 1980s, after previously relying heavily on L1 writing scholarship to inform and shape its practices, L2 writing began to establish itself as a separate discipline driven increasingly by its own theories and research. Its emerging research agenda addressed such topics as lexical proficiency (Ellis, 2002; Nation, 2001; Santos, 1988), strategy use (Ellis, 1990) peer editing (Ferris & Hedgecock, 1998; Hyland, 2002; Reid, 1993), L2 literacy pedagogy (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991), the role of grammar in academic writing (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Ferris, 2004; Hinkel, 2003; Johns, 2002); and reading-writing connections and L2 academic literacy (Carson & Leki, 1993; Grabe, 2001; Hirvela, 2001).
With respect to source-based writing, a focus that has drawn particular interest is plagiarism (Bloch, 2000; Currie, 1998; Howard, 1993, 1999, 2000; Pecorari, 2003, 2006; Shi, 2004, 2010). In fact, several scholars have documented L2 writers’ use of source texts in the context of what some call ‘inappropriate textual borrowings.’ However, they offer alternative explanations for student’s misuse of source texts, in particular, the lack of intention to deceive (Currie, 1998; Howard, 1993, 2000; Pecorari, 2001; Shi, 2006, 2010). Howard (1993) offers a new term, “patchwriting,” to alternatively explain why second language writers may use source texts inappropriately to compose a text. By patchwriting, she means “copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures or plugging in one-for-one synonym-substitutes” (p.233). She contends that some causes of “patchwriting” may be due to “uneven reading comprehension” in which the student lacks a complete understanding of a text and hence is unable to paraphrase or frame the discussion of the text. Or the second cause may be that “she merges her voice with that of the source to create a pastiche over which she exercises a new-found control” (Howard, 2001 p.1). Howard considers patchwriting as a natural stage in the development of a novice academic writer who is not yet independent in academic discourse. Hence, she claims that cultural differences alone cannot account for inappropriate source text use.

Exploration of this topic has led to scholarship in such closely related areas as paraphrasing, summarizing, direct quotation, and synthesizing and thus expanded the boundaries of research on source-based writing.
While looking at plagiarism and other dimensions of source-based writing, the emphasis has been, as noted earlier in the chapter, on students’ use of nonliterary texts; the topic of how multilingual writers respond to a combination of literary and nonliterary source texts has remained largely unexplored, and yet students may well wish to use both types of sources in certain writing situations, and in some cases may be required to do so. The absence of such research is especially notable in the context of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) writing courses that international students are often required to take in their first year of university study so as to begin equipping them to meet the academic literacy demands found in other courses.

The notion of English for Academic Purposes, which began to take meaningful shape around the same time that L2 writing emerged as field in its own right, is an especially important one in the context of source-based writing instruction. In the context of L2 writing instruction, EAP has much to offer, in that it foregrounds the need to understand and gain command of the conventions and practices that operate in academic domains or communities. Indeed, EAP now has its own journal, the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, which generally features writing-related research, thus signifying its strong links to L2 writing instruction. Despite these links, there is ongoing debate over how EAP writing instruction should be approached. For instance, should EAP writing courses teach generic academic literacy skills that could be transferred to discipline-specific writing contexts? Or is that transfer unlikely to occur successfully? A derivative of this debate is whether the approach should be designed to give students a disciplinary overview or to prepare them for life in the university and modern society (Johns, 2003).
Some have argued that EAP courses should be tied to specific disciplinary contexts in a content-based approach. In this scenario, students from a particular discipline would take a writing course which focuses only on the academic literacy content and practices of their discipline, e.g., business, especially within a genre-based approach.

The debates just described bring into play such related issues as what kinds of skills should be taught, and what kinds of instructional materials should be used in EAP writing courses. In the case of the latter, most EAP courses tend to focus exclusively on nonliterary texts for reasons discussed earlier, i.e., that such texts are seen as more relevant and more manageable, thus underestimating or simply dismissing the value of literary texts. In fact, historically, the role of literature in the teaching of academic writing has always been seen as a barrier to acquiring literacy (Lindemman, 1993), even though the ability to read target language literature was historically regarded as the marker of proficiency in that language and a “capstone of the foreign language learning experience” (Marckwardt, 1978 cited in Belcher & Hirvela, 2001, p. 111). Indeed, for some foreign language learners, the language was being learned at least in part to gain access to its literature. Whereas literature has occupied a prominent place in foreign language instruction, its role in the teaching of L2 writing has remained rather ambivalent. Some L2 writing specialists believe that the use of literature in a second language writing classroom has been overlooked due to the depiction that literary texts are syntactically, lexically and culturally too difficult for non-native speakers of English (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001). As such, there would be little or no reason to include them among the source texts students are expected to use.
Writing from sources, in which writers are expected to integrate and synthesize ideas from multiple texts, is an important discursive skill that novice multilingual writers need to learn in order to complete some writing tasks, such as writing a research paper. In academic research-writing, writers need to position their argument and support it with appropriate evidence. In addition, they may need to integrate various sources in order to demonstrate their ability to perform such core academic literacy acts as summarizing and paraphrasing efficiently and to clearly indicate boundaries between source texts and their own “authorial identity” (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Hyland, 2002). However, literary texts, with their complexity of narration, theme, plot and characters, as well as the use of literary language, can pose several challenges to writers whose first language is not English, who are seeking to use source texts as a form of evidence to support their argument. For example, how is a character’s experience cited? Due to the very nature of literary texts, when used in an academic writing classroom as source texts, L2 writers may struggle with identifying and using elements of the text as evidence to compose their own text. As such, and as noted earlier, there has generally been a belief among EAP specialists that literary texts are not relevant or useful. Typically, EAP courses rely only on nonliterary texts, because they are believed to be the more commonly utilized sources in other courses across the academy.

Given the general discomfort with the use of literature in source-based writing and in EAP writing instruction and the absence of literary texts in EAP writing courses, studies that look at how source texts are used in L2 writers’ acquisition of academic literacy skills are rare. As such, there is an incomplete picture of how L2 writers engage
such texts for source-based writing purposes. This study was designed to address that gap in the literature.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study is not concerned with inappropriate textual borrowing; rather, the purpose of this study was to investigate how novice multilingual writers navigated the academic discursive practice of source-based writing using both literary and nonliterary source texts. Writing using multiple texts represents an important learned academic skill (Wette, 2010), but is rather complex in its implementation, especially when the source texts employed differ fundamentally in nature, as in the case of nonliterary and literary texts. In light of such complexities and the need to better understand them, the study sought to explore how novice multilingual writers responded to a combination of literary and nonliterary source texts in a research-based EAP writing course. The purpose of the study was to further our understanding of the complicated processes involved in learning the practice of writing from multiple sources, literary and nonliterary, while at the same time, from the perspective of educators and researchers, contributing to the larger context of EAP writing instruction by widening the lens in which such instruction can take place. Hence, the broad overarching question that my study addressed was:

- In a course like English for Academic purposes (EAP) which focused on source-based writing, what is the place of literature to teach research-based writing?

The two main research questions that I addressed were:
How did undergraduate multilingual writers in an EAP course navigate the academic discursive practice of synthesizing texts and integrating both literary and nonliterary texts as source texts into the composition of their research-based writing assignments?

How did undergraduate multilingual writers respond to literary texts as source texts? To what extent, and how effectively, did they use literary texts as sources compared to nonliterary, information-based source texts?

**Significance of the Study**

Not many studies have investigated source-based writing in an EAP course; hence, there is a dearth of literature on source-based writing that uses a combination of literary and nonliterary texts. What sets this study apart from other studies is the use of a literary text to teach research-writing in an EAP course, while previous research has looked at primarily nonliterary texts. Thus, the study addresses the important and often contentious debate over the use of literature in EAP writing instruction, particularly in the context of the use of literary texts as source texts. If EAP is to move forward as a mode of delivery for L2 writing instruction, it needs clarity over the debate concerning literature. At the same time, L2 writing specialists, whether working in the EAP framework or other instructional modalities, need more understanding of literature’s potential as a tool in L2 writing instruction as well as insights into how students actually engage the use of literary (and nonliterary) texts for source-based writing purposes. As such, the study expands the boundaries of L2 writing research and pedagogy.
Secondly, the qualitative approach of using textual analysis with ethnographic techniques and a fine-grained analysis of students’ essays/texts to understand how the participants negotiated their way into academic discursive practices of using sources to compose their own text constitutes the other significant aspect of this study. By qualitative approach to the study of source-based writing and multilingual writers, this study provides a thick description of the setting and context which these writers navigated. It thus allows for a combination of research methods to examine texts produced in a second language context. In qualitative research, the source of data is a natural setting in which the researcher attempts to observe, describe and interpret settings as they are, therefore maintaining what Patton refers to as an “empathic neutrality” (1990, p. 55). Using qualitative data helped to accurately capture the challenges multilingual writers face while negotiating elements of source-based writing. This, in turn, points to an additional area of significance: the study looks at source-based writing as it unfolds through students’ eyes. While there is also value in learning about teachers’ encounters with source-based writing, it is essential to know more about what happens to students as they engage the various demands and challenges of source-based writing.

**Limitations of the Study**

Writing from sources is a complex academic discursive practice which was examined through the qualitative research method of multiple case studies. While qualitative case studies have several advantages, in that they add richness, breadth and complexity to any inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011), a combination that is hard to find in quantitative studies, it is important to remember the limitations that come with this
research method. One limitation of this study may be the small sample size of three case study participants that this study used. Hence, a limitation of the findings in this study lies in their lack of generalizability to other contexts. Each case study participant came to the study with a unique cultural, rhetorical and educational background in addition to their diverse literacy and personal experiences, which may not be representative of other novice multilingual students. Moreover, this study did not examine the course but only what the students did in the course. Hence any data pertaining to the instructor and teaching materials was not examined, which in turn limited data analysis possibilities.

Another limitation of this study related to the identity of the researcher. As the classroom instructor and the main instrument of data collection, while there were several advantages to the study such access to the site and rapport with the participants to name a few, there were also some challenges that I encountered. For example, performing normal duties as the teacher and researcher simultaneously proved to be difficult in actual practice. Baird and Northfield (1992) refer to this as one of the persistent trials of teacher-research. As a teacher-researcher, although I did have the privilege to spend considerable time in the research context and thus gain an insider perspective to how students composed and wrote from sources, my subjectivity did permeate the design and interpretation of my data. Another limitation related to researching my own classroom lies in the fact that observer effects may have occurred. When participants are aware that their classroom discussions and texts will be recorded and analyzed, it is likely that they may modify or change their behavior, which in turn can interfere with the validity of inferences about what normally occurs in the their texts. To compensate for this
inevitable subjectivity and these observer effects, I triangulated the data by drawing from several data sources and comparing and cross-checking the consistency of information to minimize the factors affecting the outcome of the study.

While the outcomes of the study may be valuable to researchers seeking to learn more about students’ use of source texts, specifically literary texts as source texts, it is important to note that only one literary text was used in the course. Thus, the students’ perceptions and use of literary texts as source texts may not be accurately represented if the choice of novel did not appeal to them. Hence, the term “literary text” in this context was restricted to the one book that was selected for the course and not all literary texts. Additionally, it is important to note the specific context in which the literary text was used. Due to the fact that it was a required text in the course, it needs to be acknowledged that the students may have possibly used the literary text as a source text because of the need to meet the expectations of the course.

Assumptions

This study was guided by several assumptions that are listed below:

1. Academic literacies are embedded in larger social and cultural contexts.

2. Academic literacies are ideological in nature as they are situated in institutional contexts which are sites of discourse and power.

3. Writing from sources is a complex discursive practice that students have to learn.

4. English for Academic Purposes provides students with a generic brand of skills and knowledge.

5. Academic discourse communities are entities that students seek membership to.
Definitions of Key Terminology

The following terms are operationally used for the purpose of the study:

**Academic discourse:** or discourse of the academy refers to written and spoken texts that characterize the values, beliefs and conventions shared by members of an institution.

**Discursive practices:** refer to the reading and writing practices of students that usually conform to a discourse community.

**Academic writing:** includes the writing done for the purposes of the academy or “schooling” and which follows specific writing conventions and a formal register.

**Discourse Community:** I use Swale’s definition in which a group of people share characteristics of talking, believing, acting, interpreting, and using written language (Swales, 1990).

**EAP (English for Academic Purposes) Writing** refers to writing courses that place emphasis on “developing new kinds of literacy: equipping students with the communicative skills to participate in particular academic and cultural contexts” (Hyland and Hamp-Lyons, 2002 p.2). As a sub-domain of English for Specific purposes, EAP in this context specifically includes the composition courses designed for undergraduate international students to learn general academic skills of reading and writing.

**Literary texts:** refers to texts that use language in aesthetic and engaging ways to entertain, express feelings and evoke emotions. These texts tend to use rhetorical appeals of ethos, pathos and logos to persuade readers and may be in the form of fictional or nonfictional and contemporary and traditional texts.
Nonfiction texts: Texts with a storytelling style of writing that combines journalistic perspectives with the texture, drama and emotional punch of a novel, thus providing the reader with a fascinating reconstruction of true accounts combined with intriguing detail and weaved with stylistic prose.

Nonliterary texts: refers to information-based texts that use language in precise ways to report on events and issues and explain, argue or analyze using opinions.

Creativity – For the purpose of this study, the term creativity refers to a new combination of ideas that are contextualized differently or in an unexpected context.

Source-based writing: refers to writing from multiple sources for argumentative purposes and for purposes of paraphrasing and summarizing.

Overview of Chapters

This dissertation is a multiple case study that explored how three novice multilingual writers navigated the complex academic practice of source-based writing using literary and nonliterary texts. It consists of 7 chapters. Following this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 presents an overview of the theoretical formulations that this study drew on; namely, the Vygotsky’s (1978) Sociocultural perspectives on mediation as extended by Lantolf. The chapter also includes scholarly research on second language literacy studies that situates the study within a larger body of research and includes a discussion on how nonfiction texts may fit on the continuum of literature. Chapter 3 describes the methodological framework for the study, which includes a qualitative case study inquiry. This chapter also provides a detailed description of the data collection and analysis procedures and discusses issues of ethical concerns.
Chapters 4, 5 and 6 present findings for each of the focal participants in the study—Jie, Randy and Hyunjin. While the three cases are presented separately in these three chapters, cross-case analysis occurs at those times where it advances the purposes of the study. The concluding chapter, Chapter 7, presents specific answers to the study’s research question through a summary and discussion of the findings. This chapter also includes implications of the study, directions for future research, and the major contributions of the study.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

With the increasing number of international students enrolled in North American universities, there is a growing body of research that has sought to document and explore the academic literacy practices that multilingual students encounter (for example, Casanave, 2002; Kubota, 2004; Leki, 2007; Leki & Carson, 1993; Spack, 1997, 2004; Zamel, 1993, 1998). Within these studies, a range of issues have been addressed, such as the nature of writing programs to adequately prepare and support student’s learning in various disciplinary contexts (Belcher, 2006; Braine, 1995; Carter, 1983; Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002; Widdowson 1984); the complex nature of academic discourse (Casanave, 1995; Elbow, 1993; Harris, 1989; Hyland, 2000; Johns, 1997; Leki, 2007; Prior, 1998; Spack, 1988; Zamel, 1998; Zhu, 2004); and specific academic writing tasks such as source-based writing which students seem to struggle with (Borg, 2000; Campbell, 1990; Dovey, 2010; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Wette, 2010). Consequently, several scholars have argued for various approaches to equip students with skills necessary to participate in specific academic and cultural contexts within the university. All of the above studies have shed light on some complex academic literacy practices that novice
academic writers have to grapple with in order to successfully participate in their respective academic discourse communities.

This chapter provides a literature review and theoretical framework to understand how novice undergraduate multilingual writers navigate the academic literacy practice of source-based writing using literary and nonliterary source texts. In attempting to situate this study within a larger body of research pertaining to the academic literacy of second language writers, I review literature that provides an overview of studies in second language literacy and discuss the academic literacy and sociocultural perspectives that framed this study.

Hence, the first section of this chapter describes a review of literature that informed the study, specifically the academic literacy perspectives, contexts and tasks, as well as the theoretical framework that oriented this study, which includes the sociocultural theory of mediation put forth by Lantolf. The third part of this chapter addresses the conceptualization of the term “literature” and situates nonfiction texts within this continuum. The research provided in this chapter serves as a contextual framework that informed my interpretation of the data in this study.

**Academic Literacy Perspectives**

Traditionally, literacy was seen to be a unitary concept which was concerned with the acquisition of cognitive skills, which, once acquired, could be used in any context. Over the past two decades, the notion of literacy as a discrete functional skill has been challenged by scholars of the New Literacy Studies (NLS) (Barton, 1994; Street, 1984) who argue for recognizing the social and cultural characteristics of literacy and the notion
of multiple literacies. Street, a leading scholar of the NLS, proposes two contrasting models of literacy: "autonomous" and "ideological," the former referring to literacy as independent of social context and the latter as focusing on social relationships that surround particular literacy practices. In this latter view, literacy is understood as a social practice embedded in specific cultural contexts and “inextricably linked to cultural and power structures in society” (Street, 1993, p.7). The ideological model posits that literacy “is about knowledge: the ways in which people address reading and writing are themselves rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, and being (Street, 2003 pp.77-78). What this means is that the very concept of literacy is always contested, because it is rooted in particular social and cultural contexts; hence, the ways in which instructors and students interact with literacy has an impact on the kind of literacy learned. In this sense, literacy is viewed as a social practice rooted in a specific world view and determined by dominant discourses (Street, 2003).

The conceptualization of literacy as embedded in social contexts and within certain ideologies has recently been applied to higher education settings (Lea & Street, 1998). This framework by Lea and Street sought to understand student writing in higher education from a more culturally sensitive view of literacy practices. A key argument they made was that writing practices in higher education should not only focus on skills and effectiveness, but rather on epistemology, in the sense that we should look at what counts as knowledge and who has authority over it. Additionally, their argument suggests the need for writing practices in higher education to take into account the uniqueness of an individual’s cultural and linguistic histories, thus connecting discursive practices in the
academy to the self and agency. Students entering university are supposed to meet the expectations of educational and institutional practices, which involve adapting to new ways of constructing and organizing knowledge, and these practices fail to take into account that “meanings are produced for individuals who are engaged in any process of reading and writing” (Jones et. al., 1999, p.106). According to Lea & Street (1998), institutional practices need to be understood as ways of doing that are situated in their social and cultural histories; hence, they argue for acknowledging the complex epistemological issues that underlie academic literacy practices. In doing so, they distinguish between three models or perspectives of student writing in higher education: study skills, academic socialization, and the academic literacies perspective.

The “Study Skills” approach views literacy as a set of decontextualized skills that is learned and transferred to other contexts and is based on the model of language that emphasizes grammar and spelling. This approach provides a narrow view of skills as being discrete and ignores the broader issue of learning and social context within which learning occurs. Their second model, the “Academic Socialization” approach, on the other hand, focuses on socializing students into academic culture and involves orienting students to learning and interpreting learning tasks. This perspective tends to treat writing as a “transparent medium of representation in which disciplinary forms are merely reflected in, rather than constructed by, written texts” (Jones, et al., 1999 p.107). Hence, it assumes that once students learn the textual conventions of disciplinary discourses, they will have no problems accessing institutional discourses. The third approach by Lea and Street, the “Academic Literacies” perspective, encompasses both the models of
study skills and academic socialization to provide a broader understanding of student writing within issues of power relations, identities and institutional practices. What distinguishes it from academic socialization is that this model views the process of acquiring literacy as complex and situated and perceives student writing and learning at the epistemological level and level of identity construction (Lea, 1999). “It foregrounds the institutional nature of what counts as knowledge in any particular academic context” (Lea & Street, 2006 p.369) and sees student writing as “constitutive and contested” (Jones et al., 1999, p.xx). The three models are not mutually exclusive and could be applied to any academic context.

Lea and Street’s Academic Literacies perspective takes a multifaceted approach to literacy practices in which literacies are recognized as multiple and embedded in socially constructed practices and allows us to better understand the complexities that novice writers experience when learning the discursive practices of the academy because it highlights that “reading and writing literacies are cultural and social practices, and vary depending upon the particular context in which they occur” (Lea, 2004, p. 740). Hence, this perspective offers a lens through which one can view the process of acquiring literacy as complex and situated and operating within cultural norms. However, it is important to note that the Academic Literacies framework as originally conceived was rooted primarily in the context of native language (L1) writers and the writing demands they faced. In applying this framework to an L2 context, while writing research papers is a multifaceted task novice multilingual students have to grapple with, this sophisticated task requires writers to combine various skills of argumentation, evaluation of sources,
citation practices, and source integration, which is rather complex in its implementation. Specifically, L2 writers may have linguistic difficulties that may affect their language use and reading abilities in addition to cultural barriers that may impede their interpretation of the texts they read or write (Spack, 1998, p. 97). Thus, their linguistic and cultural challenge can add up to a significant degree of difficulty, making the discourse components of the task even more complex for them. Hence, the Academic Literacies perspective recognizes the variety of communicative practices that may exist in the curriculum and allows us to take a more “socially-sensitive” view of literacy practices in higher education. Moreover, this frame lays emphasis on identities and social meanings and attempts to nurture diverse intercultural perspectives in academic reading and writing in higher education.

**Academic Literacy Contexts**

Situating academic literacy practices within specific social and cultural contexts such as the university would help us better understand the embedded nature of these practices. Specifically, since this study was located in the EAP domain, it is important to understand the significance of genre-based pedagogies that characterize most ESL programs today.

In the past two decades, the teaching of second language writing has been dominated by genre-based approaches such as “English for Specific Purposes” (ESP) and “English for Academic Purposes” (EAP). These approaches, which originated through the work of Halliday (1985) and Swales (1990), serve a communicative purpose of teaching writing through specific rhetorical moves. In other words, a genre-based
approach to the teaching of writing focuses on providing language learners with knowledge of rhetoric organization and linguistic features of a specific genre. The pioneering work of Swales (1981, 1990) in “genre analysis” gave rise to “English for Specific Purposes” (ESP) and “English for Academic Purposes” (EAP), both of which have recently become increasingly influential in the teaching of composition in higher education.

The ESP movement gained ascendancy in several writing programs nationwide due to the increasing number of second language learners in fields of science, technology and business; it specifically targets learners’ needs by using methodologies and activities that are discourse oriented and centered on language relevant to a specific discourse community (Dudley-Evans, 1997). While some scholars characterize ESP as focused on “learner centeredness” (Carter, 1983; Hutchinson & Waters, 1987), others describe ESP as having “an ever diversifying and expanding range of purposes” (Belcher, 2006, p. 134). Due to the fact that ESP emphasizes “practical outcomes” based on needs analysis (Dudley-Evans & St. John, 1998, p.1), several researchers have questioned whether the focus of ESP should be on learning disciplinary writing skills or on general writing skills.

As a sub-domain of ESP, EAP also focuses on preparing students for writing across disciplines; however, EAP often emphasizes equipping the learner with a more general and broad set of academic skills to support their learning in disciplinary contexts. Hence, the EAP perspective is that they need to equip students with this more generic brand of academic literacy knowledge and skills as a prelude or stepping stone into more discipline-specific writing that follows, with students then ready to transfer this academic
literacy background to the writing (and reading) demands at work in their chosen disciplinary community. However, Jordan (1997) asserts that EAP writing instruction needs to target cross-disciplinary skills or discipline-specific (i.e., targeting skills that are particular to an academic subject). In alignment with Jordan, Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002 p.2) in their definition of EAP, highlight the importance of discipline-specific instruction that focuses on “understanding of the cognitive, social and linguistic demands of specific academic disciplines.” Spack (1993), another EAP critic, takes a prescriptive approach to EAP and contends that EAP approaches should place emphasis on students’ experiences and motivations and student engagement in academic texts rather than on genres and specific disciplines. She states that “academic writing is an engaging and personal-sometimes exuberant-process of seeking knowledge and understanding. Academic writing presupposes concern, curiosity, commitment, a need to know, and a need to tell” (Spack, 1993, p. 185). Hence, she asserts that writing teachers should design courses that help develop students’ sense of inquiry and help them learn rhetorical principles and skills that are transferable to other disciplines. Similarly, Benesch (1995) argues for a critical pedagogic approach in which the focus is on “sociocultural awareness” and “political, historical and economic factors that shape discourses” (p.192). Accordingly, critics of the EAP domain suggest moving away from reductionist pedagogies that view genres as fixed and decontextualized and encourage considering genres as strongly situated practices in specific contexts (Spack, 2004).

Related to the issue of formulaic approaches to teaching academic writing is the question of whether “academic discourse communities are monolithic, unchanging and
easily identifiable entities” (Zamel, 1998, p.189). Due to a non-definitive understanding of academic discourse, determining what academic literacy is has always been a challenge for researchers. At a general level of understanding, academic discourse can be understood as specific reading and writing practices valued in an academic discourse community. Social theorist such as Carter (1990) define an expert writer as “one who has attained the local knowledge that enables her to write as a member of a discourse community” (p. 226). Hyland supports this notion of local knowledge by stating that novice writers “do not lack generic skills; they are simply unfamiliar with local expectations” (p.60). The notion of community remains central to the definition of academic discourse, in that knowledge is “community-generated and community-maintained” (Hyland, 2009, p.12). Bartholomae (1986, p. 4) nicely captures this view of writing as a member of a discipline and defines academic discourse as “peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding, and arguing that define the discourse of our community” and adds that, “the students have to appropriate (or be appropriated by) a specialized discourse and they have to do this as though they were members of the academy.” Within higher education settings, and in particular, within an L2 context, multilingual students entering university are often expected to be equipped with literacy practices that are already an established part of academic discourse and which include the knowledge of linguistic, social and cultural features of academic discourse used by specific academic disciplines.

Within the context of L2 writing, a noteworthy longitudinal case study of academic writing was conducted by Spack (1997) described the tensions experienced by
a Japanese undergraduate student, Yuko, while attempting to learn the academic discursive practices an American university. Using interviews, classroom observations, and various written artifacts collected over a period of three years, Spack studied the experiences of her participant, Yuko, across various disciplines such as political science, economics, social sciences and international relations. She noted that since most investigations of L2 writing have tended to focus on the language learning classroom, it was important to explore some of the literacy practices that L2 writers navigated outside of the ESL classroom. She states, “we need to investigate what it means for students to undergo a long and ever-changing process of acquiring- that is internalizing and gaining ownership of it- academic literacy, defined as the ability to read and write about the various texts assigned in college” (p. 4). Spack analyzes several of Yuko’s writing artifacts gathered over the period of three years and notes how Yuko went from avoiding reading and writing courses to completely overcoming her fear and using sources effectively in her arguments. In summarizing Yuko’s experience, Spack (1997 p.47) states:

Overall, Yuko matured as a reader and writer as she received meaningful input from numerous classroom experiences and from instructors who were conversant in their own fields and who could provided guidance for the work in particular courses. She learned through continual practice by becoming immersed in the subject matter.

The case of Yuko is a landmark study in the field of L2 writing, as it highlights the complex nature of academic discourse and illustrates the various the tensions and frustrations experienced by novice multilingual writers while navigating complex academic discursive practices.
Nonetheless, several researchers would argue that academic writing cannot be seen as a rigid structure and argue against trying to define academic writing claiming that it is not unitary and not a set of procedures to be mastered (Elbow, 1993; Harris, 1989; Leki, 2007; Spack, 1988; Zamel, 1998); hence, in their view, equipping students with certain skills that represent dominant tasks across various disciplines, is insufficient to prepare for them for an effective education. Drawing on their understanding of the university as a discourse community, Coles & Wall (1987) emphasize the need to “demystify” academic discourse and place importance on representing student’s experiences and valuing the knowledge they bring to the community. Hyland (2002) emphasizes the need to challenge widely held assumptions that “academic conventions are universal and independent of particular disciplines” (p.6), since this gives learners the impression that they need to master a set of transferable skills. Although there exist considerable variations in disciplinary conventions across the curriculum, as well as differences in the structure of certain genres as Horowitz (1986) and Braine (1995) found in their research, there is also evidence that suggests that academic discourses have specific literacies that need to be mastered in order for L2 students to function as fully participating members of their discourse communities (Casanave, 1995; Hyland, 2000; Johns, 1997; Prior, 1998; Zhu, 2004).

Arguably, even though academic writing may be bound by layers of complexity, there remains a widely agreed conceptualization of academic writing that certain discursive practices must be acquired. Since writing in other disciplines encompasses writing assignments that involve summarizing articles, constructing research papers, and
critiquing texts (Braine, 1995; Carson, 2001; Leki & Carson, 1997), much of EAP instruction has been focused on helping students acquire universal academic writing skills that involve paraphrasing, summarizing and synthesizing information from various text sources. The need to equip students with this specialized type of academic literacy is important in order for them to be successful readers and writers in their academic courses (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Sutton, 1997)

**Academic Literacy Tasks**

The nature of academic literacy tasks in higher education settings has become a significant issue, specifically in the L2 context of multilingual writers seeking to learn discursive practices. With the increasing diversity of students in higher education, faculty across the disciplines are concerned about the linguistic and cultural barriers that may prevent L2 writers from fully participating in their disciplinary communities (Zamel, 1998). While EAP programs attempt to “ground instruction in an understanding of cognitive, social and linguistic demands of specific academic disciplines” (Hyland & Hamp-Lyons, 2002, p.2), another crucial issue facing EAP instruction is that of increasingly diverse genres and academic tasks across the disciplines.

Pioneering research exploring the nature of academic writing tasks across disciplines was done by Horowitz in 1986 when he studied the writing tasks assigned to undergraduate students in various disciplines. He identified seven categories: summary of/reaction to a reading; annotated bibliography; report on a specified participatory experience; connection of theory and data; case study; synthesis of multiple sources; and research project (Horowitz, 1986). Additionally, Johns (1981) has also emphasized that
two dominant skills should remain emphasized in academic writing: paraphrasing and summarizing (Johns, 1981). In fact, Brogan and Brogan (1982) conducted a study on ethical problems in technical writing and reported a high degree of plagiarism in the writing of both foreign students as well as native English speaking engineering students. Based on their report, they suggest that paraphrasing and summarizing should be emphasized in composition courses for international students in order to assist their discernment of the difference between paraphrasing and plagiarizing.

In support of this argument, Zhu (2004) examined the academic writing views of business and engineering faculty and reported that there was some belief that students needed to possess a good foundation of well-developed general writing skills prior to developing discipline-specific processes. Specifically, in his study, faculty views on academic writing were conceptualized differently: one group held the view that a set of generalizable writing skills such as audience awareness, logical organization, paragraph development, clarity, sentence structure, grammar, and mechanics were transferable across various contexts. The other group considered academic writing as the knowledge of disciplinary thought and specific communication processes that were developed after a basic foundation of good writing skills were learned. This study highlights that there may be an expectation for students to possess a good foundation of general writing skills.

A study similar to Horowitz’s was conducted by Braine (1995), who examined the various writing tasks assigned in undergraduate courses in the Natural Sciences and Engineering fields. Five genres were identified based on the assignments and their instructional specifications: summary/reaction, experimental report (design), case study,
Accordingly, Braine found summarizing and paraphrasing to be vital writing skills. Although paraphrasing, summarizing and the research paper writing may be listed as primary skills needed to be mastered by novice discourse community members; clearly, what this indicates is that there are certain academic writing tasks that are common to various disciplines and students are expected to possess these literacy skills in order to fully participate in academic discourse communities.

Recently, L2 scholars have attempted to argue for various approaches to equip students with skills necessary to participate in specific academic and cultural contexts within the university, and several researchers have emphasized the reading-writing connecting in the teaching of L2 academic writing (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Ferris & Hedgecock, 1998; Grabe, 1991; Nelson, 1998) which has influenced the integrated nature of several academic writing tasks (see Plakans, 2009). To add to this field of inquiry, Carson and Leki (1993) document the complex link between reading and writing abilities and the “extent to which reading can be, and in academic settings nearly always, is the basis for writing” (p.1). Additionally, Grabe (1991) recognized the value of teaching reading and writing together in academic writing instruction. Reading-to-write tasks refer to tasks that include the combination of reading and writing skills for various educational purposes and involves the interplay of reading and writing processes (Delaney, 2008).

Specifically in the context of multilingual writers, several L2 researchers in the field of academic literacy have argued that several factors can affect reading to write performance in many ways such as, language proficiency (Currie, 1998; Howard, 1996; Kirkland & Saunders, 1990); strategic competence stemming from lack of text-based experience to
implement the task (Canale & Swain, 1990; Grabe, 2001; Plakans, 2009), and the context and purpose of the writing task (Campbell, 1990; Chandrasoma et. al., 2004; Currie, 1998).

Common reading-to-write tasks that students at the university engage in while using sources are summarizing and paraphrasing, which are considered to be fundamental skills that writers of academic texts need to use in order to demonstrate comprehension of source text material. Both these tasks entail reading and writing from source texts; however, a crucial aspect of summarizing involves the skill of paraphrasing (Hirvela & Du, 2013; Hyland, 2000). Hirvela and Du (2013) explain that “paraphrasing provides meaningful opportunities for students to practice close reading of target texts and language and thus enhance their reading and writing skills” (p.88). Some researchers (Campbell, 1990; Keck, 2006; Roig, 1999; Shi, 2004, 2012; Yamada, 2003) have gone a step further to differentiate between the various levels of paraphrasing. For example, Campbell (1990) introduces subcategories of paraphrases and differentiates between Exact copy, Near copy and Paraphrase explaining that these are not separated categories but represent “points along a continuum” (p.216). Roig (1999) classifies superficial paraphrasing as synonym substitution or modification of sentence structure in which five consecutive words or more are borrowed from the original text. Additionally, Shi (2004) defines “closely paraphrased texts” as those that are “paraphrased by reformulating syntax or changing wording of the original text” (p.263) and “total paraphrases” as those which contain “no trace of direct borrowing of two or three consecutive words from
source texts” (pp.178-179). And more recently, Keck (2006) in her study, compared L1 and L2 writer’s use of paraphrases in their summary writing. Using a taxonomy of paraphrasing types, she classified them into Near Copy, Minimal Revision, Moderate Revision and Substantial Revision and noticed that L2 writers tended to use more Near copies than L1 writers. As seen in the above studies, the levels and categorical definitions of paraphrasing differ from study to study and the lack of consistency in definition make it difficult to fully comprehend the strategies used by academic writers at the university (Keck, 2006).

Closely linked to the scholarship of using source texts, and particularly related to paraphrasing and summarizing is the issue of textual plagiarism in L2 writing that many L2 researchers have tended to focus on (Campbell, 1990; Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004, 2010, 2012). Campbell (1990) investigated the writing of novice academic writers by comparing three groups of students; namely, L1 students, less advanced L2 students and more proficient L2 students. She found that all three groups relied on copying from source texts as a strategy. Similarly, Shi (2004) studied written summaries of undergraduate L1 and L2 writers and found that while both groups relied on source texts heavily for quotations, L2 writers borrowed material from source texts without explicitly mentioning the individual authors. However, Howard (1995) offers an alternative explanation for student’s misuse of source texts and argues that “patchwriting” is a developmental stage for novice writers and hence should not be seen as an element of intentional deception. Likewise, Angelil-Carter’s (2000) findings indicate that plagiarism is a survival strategy of all novice writers and may not be limited
to only L2 writers. She asserts that plagiarism can be seen as novice writer’s attempt to establish their self-identities as new writers. In alignment with Howard’s model and to provide a comprehensive description of student’s texts, Pecorari (2003) examined the texts of 17 post graduate students and compared student’s texts with the original source texts and found that all 17 writers “gave a misleading impression of their source use” (p.333). The student-generated texts showed evidence of textual features taken from source texts which could be described as plagiarism. However, a closer textual analysis revealed that students had borrowed from secondary sources without attributing credit to the original author and the student interviews showed no intention to deceive; rather they were uncertain about citing secondary sources. Pecorari concludes her article by acknowledging the widespread phenomenon of inappropriate textual borrowing but emphasizes the need for educators to distinguish between “patchwriting” (Howard, 1995) and plagiarism in order to provide effective guidance and instruction to students.

Cultural differences have often been identified as one of the factors that might explain student’s misuse of source texts. For example, Pennycook (1996) attributes the role of cultural practices such as memorization to plagiarism in Chinese ESL writers and argues for re-examination of the construct of plagiarism. He contends that “plagiarism cannot be cast a simple black and white issue and it needs to be understood in terms of complex relationships between text, memory and learning (p.201). To emphasize the cultural specificity of plagiarism and authorship in relation to citation practices, Bloch and Chi (1995) examined and compared 60 articles written by Chinese and English writers and found that plagiarism might be a “compensatory strategy used by novices”
and “Chinese rhetoric does not place the same taboo on plagiarism that Western rhetoric does” (p.238). Additionally, more recent studies such as Chandrasoma et al., (2004) and Shi (2004) have pointed out the complex and changing Asian and Western writing practices that may account for cultural differences in student’s inappropriate use of source texts and emphasize the need to recognize student’s developmental competence in using source texts.

To add to the complexity of this issue, several researchers (Pecorari & Shaw, 2012; Polio & Shi, 2012; Roig, 2001) in both L1 and L2 contexts have pointed out a variation in the operational definition of appropriate and inappropriate paraphrasing across university professors and students. For example, Roig (2001) investigated the paraphrasing practices of eight six professors across five institutions in various disciplines and found that when the professors were asked to identify whether the rewritten versions of texts they received were plagiarized or correctly paraphrased, their conceptions varied widely “from a very lax set of criteria for determining plagiarism” (p.313) to criteria that seemed even more rigorous than traditional definitions. Moreover, when the same professors were asked to produce paraphrases, a significant number of them produced texts using a paraphrasing style that “could be interpreted by others as possible plagiarism (p.315) as they contained a string of words from the original source texts. Roig concludes by pointing out that “there can be substantial differences in how paraphrasing and plagiarism are defined even within a single discipline” (p.321) and that immediate attention needs to be paid to this variation in practice.
Similar to Roig’s study, Pecorari and Shaw (2012) examined the attitudes of instructors regarding textual appropriation in academic writing. Using semi-structured interviews and a set of five pairs of texts, they interviewed eight university teachers at various Swedish universities to investigate participant views on plagiarism and source misuse. They highlighted two major themes in their study, specifically, “diverse and conflicting views on what constituted appropriate and inappropriate intertextuality” (p.152) and variation in the factors that led to their judgment of plagiarized or non-plagiarized texts. The implications of their study suggest that second language writing educators must highlight to students this variation in views regarding textual appropriation that may exist across disciplinary communities and “what is essential is, first, that whatever rules, standards and conventions are applied, they have a solid pedagogical ground, and are not arbitrary; and, secondly, that they are made transparent” (p.160). All these aforementioned studies highlight the complexities involved in writing using sources and particularly for novice academic writers “learning to write from sources requires years, not weeks or months, of practice (Li & Casanave, 2012 p.177).

A fairly common source-based writing task at the university-level that students encounter involves writing argumentative essays by incorporating information from multiple sources. This sophisticated task requires students to combine various skills of argumentation, evaluation of sources, citation practices and source integration and is rather complex in its implementation. Several L1 researchers (Greene, 1991; Kennedy, 1995; Nelson & Hayes, 1988; Segev-Miller, 2004; Spivey, 1993) have attempted to study this complex academic task of writing using sources and have attempted to analyze the
resulting products and strategies students use to complete this task. In commenting on one such task that uses sources, Sutton (1997) highlights the importance of research-based writing and argues in favor of research paper assignments contending that research paper assignments equip students with a better understanding of negotiating academic discourse. He emphasizes that students must recognize that each rhetorical situation is unique and implicit in any assignment and accordingly, should strategize their approach. He states “we should discourage students from assuming that what works in first-year composition will always transfer, unaltered, to other assignments in other disciplines” (p.48). He concludes his argument by acknowledging the importance of “generalized academic writing” conventions which students should master to prepare for writing in other disciplines. While the research paper remains an important learned skill that novice writers need to master, the complexity associated with source-based writing, particularly, the various elements of the task that go together, is quite demanding for novice academic writers and multilingual students alike.

Quite a few L2 researchers (Borg, 2000; Campbell, 1990; Dovey, 2010; Spack, 1988; Wette, 2010) have recognized the complexity of source-based writing. In her 1988 article, “Initiating ESL Students into the academic discourse community,” Spack pointed out the importance of writing from sources and stated that “assignments, such as research projects utilizing the library and perhaps data from interviews and/or observations, can ask students to evaluate and synthesize material from a number of sources in order to establish a perspective on a given subject or area of controversy (p.44). She further argued that “the most important skill English teachers can engage students in is the
complex ability to write from other texts, a major part of their academic writing experience (p.41). Wette (2010) however, points out that “the relationship between a writer of an academic text and the sources cited in that text is not entirely straightforward,” (p.159) and outlines the various procedures and composing acts involved in writing from sources. For example, writers have to comprehend the source text well enough to be able to borrow from it (Roig, 1999), and then need to select and transform specific ideas from that text (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991) to suit their rhetorical purpose. Another complexity involved in writing from sources includes the need to integrate the author’s voice and position with citations from the source text (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001). All these discursive steps involved in writing from sources are challenging for both novice writers and multilingual writers alike. Specifically, students whose first language is not English are faced with additional challenges such as limited linguistic proficiency and cultural barriers (Shi, 2004; Spack, 1998) and limited experience of text-based writing at the university (see Hirvela & Du, 2013) that may add to the multifaceted nature of the task of source-based writing.

To deal with this aforementioned complexity in source-based writing, few studies (eg. Segev-Miller, 2004; Wette, 2010) have emphasized the significance of instruction. For instance, Wette (2010) sought to investigate instructional interventions that may help novice multilingual writers learn this complex academic skill of writing from sources. To implement this objective, she carried out a practical intervention in her classroom by administering pre and post unit tests and post-unit reflective comments to 78 undergraduate students. The pre-unit test was conducted to determine the participant’s
current level of knowledge and skills in using sources, and the post unit task was assigned after eight hours of instruction on technical and discourse components of source-based writing. The reflective comments were meant to elicit discussions on the student’s experiences and challenges with using source texts. Her study found that the participants had gained some knowledge of the “technical and rule-governed aspects” (p.168) of source-based writing upon comparing pre- and post-unit test scores and direct copying from source texts had decreased considerably after instruction. More importantly, her study found that students struggled with understanding the main idea of source texts, the selection of relevant “citation-worthy text extracts,” (p.168), adopting an evaluative stance towards source texts, and linking source material with their own ideas and arguments. Her study indicates that after eight hours of instruction, while the students showed increased confidence in using source texts, they were not yet clearly proficient in using sources. She underscores the need for students to become proficient in using sources, as it constitutes an important literacy skill needed for “socialization into disciplinary communities” and suggests the need for useful instructional intervention that would help student’s “understanding of the more subtle and sophisticated aspects” (p.169) of writing from sources.

Another study conducted by Segev-Miller (2004) in an L1 context of writing from sources, showed a significant improvement in the task after instruction. In her study of 24 in-service teachers, Segev-Miller examined the effect of explicit instruction on the subject’s discourse synthesis products and processes. The subjects were asked to write a literature review and using a process log, they were asked to document their product and
processes performance based on pre and post-instruction. According to their self assessment, the subjects found rhetorical and linguistic transformation to be challenging and often replicated the structure of the original source text and “mechanically copied and quoted” (p.23). Additionally, it was found that they struggled with synthesis and presented a “shopping list” (p.23) of evidence to support their argument. However, explicit instruction on strategy use, practice in and demonstration of strategy use in using source texts seemed to help the participants make significant improvements in their final product and processes of source-based writing. The study concludes by emphasizing the need for students to document and self-assess their learning experience using process logs and for instructors to provide feedback on a regular basis. Moreover, the study highlights the importance for explicit instruction to be “as authentic and relevant as possible” (p.25).

Similarly, Dovey (2010) explored and reflected on the genre of writing a literature review in a postgraduate course she designed in an EAP context. She found that teaching decontextualized genre sets to students did not facilitate their writing from sources and she thus questions the value of teaching genres such as critical reviews to students “who have very little field-specific knowledge” (p.58). Rather, she proposes replacing the teaching of genre sets with recursive tasks that provide students with strategies “for negotiating the reading-writing nexus” (p.58) and encourages the use of graphic organizers to “scaffold and facilitate the processes of organizing, selecting and integrating information from multiple sources” (p.58).

Clearly, gaining proficiency in the skill of writing from multiple sources and the need for appropriate and specific instruction in this complex skill are both deemed to be
highly emphasized objectives of many academic literacy scholars as seen in the literature reviewed above. Nonetheless, most of these studies reviewed in source-based writing have focused on issues relating to paraphrasing, plagiarism and challenges in genres such as the literature review. Although few studies have identified instructional intervention to facilitate writing from sources, none have considered looking at the combination of use of literary and nonliterary source texts to teach research-based writing. This is where the current study fills in the gap in source-based writing literature.

The next section of this chapter will present an important theoretical formulation that this study drew upon, namely, Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of mediation as extended by Lantolf. Vygotsky’s sociocultural perspective was used as a frame in this study because it casts learning as a fundamentally social and cultural activity that is mediated by semiotic mechanisms such as signs and tools that are embedded in everyday practices.

**Sociocultural Concept of Mediation**

The theoretical framework that guides this study and serves to generate a deeper understanding of how novice academic writers navigate source-based writing was inspired by the sociocultural approach to language learning. The work of Lev Vygotsky, a Russian psychologist, was one of the largest contributions to the field of learning and Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Vygotsky was concerned with the development of learning in children and believed that learning is developmental. He focused on social interaction as essential for cognitive development; however, his emphasis was on “the
individual’s appropriation or internalization of the social process” during the social interaction (Rogoff, 1990, p.150). In other words, sociocultural theory derived from the Vygotskian perspective placed emphasis on how meaning is socially constructed and a sociocultural approach to learning is predicated upon the understanding that language learning is fundamentally a social and cultural activity.

**Mediation**

Vygotsky proposed that the human mind is mediated by semiotic mechanisms such as signs and tools and according to Lantolf (2000), this is the most fundamental concept of sociocultural theory. These semiotic (psychological tools) and physical tools are artifacts created by humans over time and include “language; various systems of counting; mnemonic techniques; algebraic symbol systems; works of art; writing; schemes; diagrams; maps; and mechanical drawings; all sorts of conventional signs and so on” (Vygotsky 1981 p.137). In Vygotsky’s view, just as individuals use technical tools for manipulating their environment, they use psychological tools for directing and controlling their physical and mental behavior (Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.8). Due to the fact that higher psychological functions are symbolically mediated (using language), individuals gain and maintain control over these complex mental processes. For example, signs function as a heuristic element that mediates our memory retrieval. So we repeat someone’s phone number numerous times in order to imprint it in our memory (Lantolf & Appel, 1994). Moreover, “humans use symbolic artifacts to establish an indirect or mediated relationship between ourselves and the world” (Lantolf, 2000 p.1).
In Vygotsky’s view, semiotic tools assist the development of higher psychological processes through internalization. These semiotic means may be appropriated from the classroom (Wertsch, 1991) in the form of classroom discourse, technology, printed materials and other material artifacts. The appropriation of tools, in particular, psychological tools, mediate the transformation of basic mental functions into higher mental functions (Vygotsky, 1978), and this transfer from the social to the cognitive plane takes place within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Therefore, the sociocultural perspective conceptualizes language learning as a developmental process mediated by semiotic resources. According to Vygotsky, (1978) “what children can do with the assistance of others might be in some sense even more indicative of their mental development than what they can do alone” (p. 85). In short, the definition of ZPD states that it is the difference between what an individual can achieve independently and what the same individual can accomplish with the help an expert or cultural artifact. To add to this definition, Lantolf (2000) explains that ZPD is a metaphorical term to understand and observe how mediational means are appropriated and internalized; and not a physical place situated in time and space (p.17). Mediation takes place in the zone of proximal development through the means of scaffolding which is described as the “role of teachers and others in supporting the learner’s development and providing support structures to get to that next stage or level” (Raymond, 2000, p. 176); however, in working with the ZPD, “it is not the successful completion of task that is of importance, but “the higher cognitive process that emerges as a result of the interaction” (Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.10).
**Mediation through Cultural Artifacts**

Vygotsky (1998) emphasized that speech and verbal thinking play an important role in the formation of new psychological structures “in the transformations from direct innate natural forms and methods of behavior to mediated artificial mental functions that develop in the process of cultural development” (p.168 cited in Kozulin et al., 2003 p.133). In other words, in Vygotsky's view, human learning and development are bound up in activity that is purposefully mediated by various tools (Wertsch, 1979). These mediating tools function as instruments which stand between the subject (individual) and the object (goal towards which the individual’s action is directed; in this case, language learning).
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*Figure 1: The Mediated Nature of Human World Relationship* (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.62)

Vygotksy (1978) explained that “the tool’s function is to serve as the conductor of human influence on the object of activity; it is externally oriented; it must lead to changes in objects” (p.55). Therefore, through tools, humans can control their behavior from the outside. From a sociocultural perspective of language learning, several tools such as, computers, language and tasks are used to mediate the learning process (Wertsch, 1991).
With the help of culturally constructed auxiliary means, Lantolf and Thorne (2006) explain how mediation through cultural artifacts is understood in sociocultural theory. In maintaining Vygotsky’s claim that higher forms of human mental activity are mediated by artifacts, they propose that “auxiliary means arise from participation in cultural activities such as raising and educating children producing art etc. in which cultural artifacts such as books, technology, paper etc. and cultural concepts such as self, person, literacy, mind etc. interact in complex dynamic ways with each other and with psychological phenomena” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.59). They further posit that this interweaving gives rise to higher mental functions (memory, learning and development) which allows individuals to voluntarily and intentionally gain control. For example, schooled literacy transforms the ways people think due to its ability to mediate our relationship to the world through decontextualized texts (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

In Lantolf’s view, one form of mediation is regulation (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Regulation, he explains, has three stages: In the first stage, a child is controlled by objects in the environment or they rely on objects in their environment in order to carry on a task. The second stage is he calls “other –regulation,” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) or scaffolding and it includes mediation from any supportive adult such as parents, siblings, peers and teachers. This form of mediation may be implicit or explicit. The final stage is called self-regulation in which the child can carry out a task independently with no support. Therefore, activities are accomplished through self-regulation which is made possible through internalization. Each of the three stages, he argues, “are symmetrical and recoverable, an individual can traverse this sequence at will, given the demands of the
task” (Frawley, 1997, p.98). In an early study by Frawley and Lantolf (1985), the performance of advanced and intermediate ESL speakers were compared during a narrative task which took place in an experimental condition. During the task, the researchers introduced an interruption or complication and found that the performance of intermediate speakers broke down and they lost control over self regulating the mediational means provided by their second language, thus allowing the task set before them to regulate their performance. However, the advanced speakers were able to better regulate and control the mediational means afforded by their second language and used it to guide themselves through the task. Thus the advanced speakers were able to control their “psychological and social activity through the language” (Lantolf, 2000 p.6). Thus, in Lantolf’s (2000) view, individuals move through stages of first “being controlled by objects in their environment, then by others in their environment and finally they gain control over their own social and cognitive activities” (p.6).

**Scaffolding as a Form of Mediation**

The metaphor of scaffolding, originally constructed by Wood et al. (1976) has recently been applied to educational psychology to describe the process by which teachers, peers, parents, caretakers offer less skilled individuals some form of assistance to solve a problem. The scaffolded assistance supports and helps the learner to complete the task that would not have otherwise been possible. Although the concept of scaffolding originated in a first language context, it is useful in analyzing second language learning situations. The role of scaffolding in L2 acquisition has been a topic of ongoing research and there have been an increasing number of empirical studies on the application of
scaffolding to SLA. Quite a few SLA research studies have investigated mechanisms of scaffolded help within ZPD in an L2 setting (Adiar-Hauck & Donato, 1994; Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Anton, 1999; DiCamilla & Anton, 1997; Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Ohta, 1995). Applied to L2 acquisition in educational settings, scaffolding is best understood as “supportive behaviors adopted by the more expert partner in collaboration with the L2 learner that might facilitate the learner’s progress to a higher level of language development” (Guerrero & Villamil, 2000, p.53).

**Face-to-face Writing Conferences as a Form of Mediation**

According to Vygotsky, language functions as a sophisticated meditational mechanism in goal directed activities (Ahmed, 1994 cited in Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.158). “For language not only functions as a mediator of social activity, by enabling participants to plan, coordinate, and review their actions through external speech; in addition, as a medium in which those activities are symbolically represented, it also provides the tool that mediates the associated mental activities in the internal discourse of inner speech” (Vygotsky, 1987 cited in Wells, 1999 p.7). Specifically, semiotic mediation in the form of language, plays an important role not only in allowing collaboration between participants but also in assisting mental development through appropriation of “inter-mental semiotic processes” (Wells, 1999 p.102). Therefore, as Wells puts it, it is talk that mediates the various modes of knowing within a culture.

For years, researchers have studied the role of conversational interaction and negotiation in L2 development. From a sociocultural perspective, language learners co-construct L2 knowledge through social interaction. Vygotsky (1989) claims that, “social interaction actually produces new, elaborate, and advanced psychological processes that
are unavailable to the organism working in isolation” (p. 61). In fact several researchers have emphasized language development through meaningful social interaction (Donato, 1994, 2000; Ohta, 1995; Pavlenko & Lantolf, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 2001). Swain (2000) posits that language is seen to mediate language learning and uses the term “collaborative dialogue” to describe language talk in the classroom. Collaborative talk is seen as an opportunity to provide comprehensible input to language learners, and from a sociocultural perspective of language learning, it recognizes the importance of dialogue as a cognitive tool to mediate language development.

Learning specialized discursive strategies that govern genres, such as source-based writing, is what multilingual writers are confronted with as they seek to enter the academic discourse community (Bartholomae, 1985; Bizell, 1984). To facilitate this process of initiation, in addition to classroom instruction, individual writing conferences between teachers and learners have become an integral part of most L2 writing courses. These face-to-face conferences or so-called “tutorials” have been viewed by most second language researchers as an efficient and effective pedagogical tool to respond to student’s writing (Ferris, 2003; Williams, 2004; Zamel, 1985) and also has received favorable attention from L2 writing specialists (Ferris, 2003; Ferris & Hedgecock, 1998; Weissberg, 2006; Williams, 2004). One of the pioneering studies in second language writing conferences between teacher and learner was done by Goldstein and Conrad (1990) in which they examined the writing conferences of three university ESL writers and their subsequent revisions and found that learners with a higher proficiency tended to negotiate more in their conferences and as a result made changes in their subsequent
drafts. Likewise, another study done by Patthey-Chavez and Ferris (1997) on teacher-learner writing conferences of advanced ESL writers found that stronger students showed more involvement in the tutorial than weaker students, which impacted the way the teacher approached the writing conference and provided feedback. Nonetheless, the researchers revealed that all of the students researched in the study made improvements in their writing after the writing conference; in light of this improvement, the researchers describe the writing conference as a “classic example of a teacher-led scaffolding” (p.51) proposed by Vygotsky (1978). Similarly, in noting the benefits of one-to-one conferences with second language learners, Weissberg (2006, p.261) stated that writing conferences are an “unparalleled opportunity to provide targeted individualized instruction.”

Specifically, from the sociocultural perspective of language learning, dialogue in writing conferences has been noted as a form of “scaffolding” for second language writers, which prompts them to revise their texts (Ewert, 2009; Weissberg, 2006). Therefore, the dialogic discourse that occurs between teacher and learner in a face-to-face tutorial, as a form of mediation offers a great source of pedagogical talk that may reveal significant patterns of second language writer’s discursive practices.

Within an L2 context, the tutor or expert’s mediated intervention should be “sensitive to the learner’s level of help required,” – and it should be provided only when needed and it should be “dialogic”- accomplished through dialogue (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994 p.468). In their study of three ESL learners in a tutor-learner interaction, Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) observed that the student’s linguistic performance was initially
mediated and enhanced by the tutor; however, later on, within and across sessions, the students demonstrated that they had internalized the tutor’s feedback and thus, showed increasing levels of independence in carrying out the task. A significant finding of their study revealed that different ZPDs exist for different learners which points out to the fact that pedagogical scaffolding needs to be strategic and determined by the close examination of the learner’s needs (van Lier, 1996). ZPD according to Lantolf & Thorne (2006) is “not only a model of the developmental process but also a conceptual tool that educators can use to understand aspects of student’s emerging capacities that are in early stages of maturation” (p.207). They argue that teachers can use the ZPD proactively as a diagnostic tool in order to create a conducive environment for specific developmental forms to take place. Within this theoretical framework, an important point they make is that change in the learner’s linguistic performance may not necessarily be a measure of development; rather development takes place when there is a change in the frequency and quality of assistance provided. Hence, the quality of mediation that prompts learners to assume greater responsibility in the task is what determines evidence for development. “Development within this context is the internalization of the mediation that is dialogically negotiated between the learner and others that results in enhanced self-regulation” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.211).

Another important concept that this study is concerned with is the notion of agency. In examining issues of agency in SLA, Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) assert that “learners actively engage in constructing the terms and conditions of their own learning…” and “it is agency that links motivation to action and defines a myriad of paths
taken by learners” (pp.145-146). In other words, learners construct agency through participation in an activity and in doing so, find new ways to mediate themselves and their relationships. They further argue that personal histories and language ideologies brought by the learner would influence the strategies and motives for learning. Thus according to them, agency as construed in activity theory is relational, historically and socially constructed and is mediated by social interactions and artifacts.

As mentioned earlier, the current study drew on the sociocultural theory of mediation as extended by Lantolf as the notion of mediation was central in understanding how multilingual novice writers navigated and negotiated elements of research-based writing. In addition, in order to make sense of the participant’s journey of navigating source-based writing in an EAP course with an exposure to a variety of source texts, the sociocultural perspective of mediation framed the question of how the participant’s negotiated elements of this academic discursive practice. Hence, given the nature of my research questions, the sociocultural framework offered a lens to understand how the semiotic mechanisms that are embedded in everyday practices have the potential to possibly mediate the navigation of academic literacy practices. Particularly, Lantolf’s framework of mediation allows us to understand how “humans deploy cultural constructed artifacts, concepts and activities to regulate and transform their material world” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.79) and with respect to second language development, how symbolic artifacts such as language activity, speaking and writing are used as mediational means for thinking. Therefore, within this perspective, human beings use physical tools such as concrete objects and symbolic tools such as language to mediate
their relationship with others and with the help of these culturally constructed means, higher mental functions emerge that allow them to gain voluntary control over the task. Moreover, since academic literacy practices that multilingual writers have to navigate are situated in social and cultural contexts, the view of learning as socially mediated provided a theoretical lens from which to better understand how the participants performed socially mediated actions such as interacting with resources in their social context to navigate and negotiate the complex elements of source-based writing.

**Conceptualizing the Term “Literature”**

This study looked at how undergraduate multilingual writers navigated research-based writing using both literary and nonliterary texts. In doing so, the overarching goal of this study was to explore the use of literature within the context of teaching research-based writing in an EAP course, since so little research has focuses on literary texts. The literary text, *Into the Wild* by John Krakauer, used in the course was classified as a nonfiction text, as will be explained later in this section. While the place of literature in an L2 academic writing classroom still needs to be determined, it is important to first conceptualize the changing notion of the term ‘literature.’ As for the term “literature,” for the purpose of this study, I conceptualize it as existing on a continuum in which the definition of literature is constantly in flux depending on the society and culture that embrace its literary qualities.

The definition of literature has come a long way from being exclusively associated with poetry and drama to include fictional and nonfictional texts. Literature is a term most commonly used to refer to the classics especially works in the form of letters,
poetry and drama. According to Peter Widdowson, (1998 p.50) from the mid to the late nineteenth-century, literature was characterized by its “aestheticisation” and within the domain of “fictive” texts. Literature exclusively included fiction, poetry and drama. The traditional definition of literature was conceptualized as “a cannon of great works which most successfully holds an essence of human experience in their poetic medium.” Therefore, central to the definition of literature was the notion of imaginary or fabricated realities articulated formally and artistically and that reflected human experiences. Some scholars believe that the term ‘literature’ denotes a sense of approval. In this view, to call a text literature is to praise it for its literary qualities, that is, qualities that make it a valuable piece of writing (Lyas, 1969).

To underscore this view, Terry Eagleton (1996), a British literary theorist, points out that in eighteenth century England, literature was not confined to creative or imaginative writing. It included any writing that was valued in society at the time; whether it was philosophy, history, essays and letters as well as poems. However, by the end of the Romantic period, literature was becoming synonymous with the “imaginative” and functioned as means of escapism and a form of political force. In his book Literary Theory: An Introduction, he enumerates several facets of the definition of literature. He begins by pointing out that literature may be imaginative; however, it is not restricted to only fictional texts. Rather he claims that literature cannot be seen as objective; therefore, characterizing it as “a set of works of assured and unalterable value, distinguished by certain shared inherent properties”, according to him, “does not exist” (p.9). Rather, he sees literature as a product of our subjective evaluation of texts. In a similar vein, Ron
Carter (1995) sees literature as texts being “produced by a culture, and highly valued within that culture over a period of time” (p.102). Hence in this view, the term literature is used to refer to texts that are valued and appreciated by a particular group of people over time.

According to Sharon Crowley (1998), literature came to be seen as “a sort of ideal repository of human experience” (p.81), specifically during the nineteenth century and during this period, the term “novel” was used to apply to only realistic fiction. By the mid-twentieth century, in a bid to develop personal humane culture, composition teachers argued for the use of literary texts to replace mass media in composition. Amidst this concern, Katherine Koller, (1955) justified the superiority of literature by emphasizing the notion that literature substituted or filled in for life. She writes “in a great poem, a drama, or a novel, the artist invites us to examine the lives of others; we see human beings like ourselves in action, and we know their innermost thoughts” (p.82, cited in Crowley p.106). The humanist perspective of literature was that it provided students with universal values and played a role in the formation of character.

Soon, literature was characterized as a “pedagogical jack-of-all-trades” (Crowley, 1998 p.109) in which “novels were seen to help both students and professors feel an idea, and animate many of the major issues surrounding the individual and his society in a way that even the best essays cannot” (Garvin, 1959, p.176 cited in Crowley, 1998, p.109). Literature was imported into composition instruction since it provided “ready illustrations of rhetorical principles.” For example, Gorrel and Laird (1972, p. 465) write that “a sonnet shows how form and organization can work; a good poem illustrates precision and
economy in diction; a short story or novel may demonstrate the value of direct sentence patterns” (cited in Crowley, 1998, p. 117).

George Orwell’s literary works in the mid twentieth-century added a new dimension to the concept of literature. His contribution to the literature legacy is depicted through his historical and ideological-based approach to literature that combined literary criticism with political analysis and displayed a straightforward prose style (Meyers, 2000). George Woodcock, who wrote the first essay about Orwell in 1946, describes his works as “essentially autobiographical and personal” and that the literary merits are much more consistent and impressive than the political qualities” (cited in Meyers, 1997 p.24). Nonetheless, as Rodden (2003) reports, Orwell’s casual journalism and utopian literary style generated widely critical attitudes by some who criticized his work as “lacking in literary sophistication” and described him as “failing to live up to literary standards.” Other critics have dismissed his fiction (a fable and a dystopia) as not fitting into standard fiction categories. Thus, if the term literature is seen on a continuum and from a critical perspective, Orwell’s writing can be considered as semi-literary.

**Situating Nonfiction Texts as Literature**

The purpose of this section is to situate the literary text, *Into the Wild*, used in the course that was the site for the study, on the literature continuum. The conception of literature took a turn in the second half of the twentieth century which saw an increase in the popularity of nonfiction texts. Literary critic Barbara Lounsberry, (1990 p.xi) in her book *The Art of Fact: Contemporary Artists of Nonfiction*, aptly highlights how nonfiction tends to be excluded from what is considered literary. She writes that
In truth, our age has stopped subscribing to the belief that the novel is the highest form of the literary imagination. It is beginning to think of fiction as only one of many artful "prose narratives in print," to use Lennard Davis's accurate phrase (44). Other compelling prose narratives are certain artful memoirs, autobiographies, biographies, histories, travelogues, essays, works of journalism, forms of nature and science writing, and ingenious combinations of these forms.

Additionally, she points out the importance of clarifying the genre of nonfiction since not all nonfiction texts may possess literary qualities enough to be called literary nonfiction. Lounsberry emphasizes the need to distinguish between “artful literary nonfiction” from the “artless and droning expository prose” that characterizes most nonfiction (p.xi).

Hence, in attempting to identify the characteristics of literary nonfiction, she outlines four constitutive features:

a) Documentable subject matter chosen from the real world as opposed to “invented” from the writer’s mind. By this she means any subject matter that includes human events, human places, human institutions or phenomena that exist in the real world.

b) Exhaustive research- By this she means a thorough research that may enable the writer to establish the credibility of their text by making references to supportable facts. She emphasizes the importance of grounding research in factual evidence in a manner that would gain the confidence of the reader. She argues that, “when the factual accuracy of a work is questioned, or when authorial promises are violated, a work of literary nonfiction is either discredited or transferred out of the category.”
c) The third crucial characteristic that defines this genre is the scene which refers to the importance of artfully painting an accurate picture for the reader in a way that the moments being described come back to life. Hence the detailed form of the scene description is what she considers consciously artful.

d) Finally, an important element of this genre is that it should have “fine writing: a literary prose style” which highlights the importance of using polished language that characterizes most literature. Such writing according to her, may splurge on assonance and alliteration (as does Talese's), or on parallel structures and repetitions (as does Didion's). Fine writers may launch metaphors as probes (like Norman Mailer), dazzle us with verbal and typographical pyrotechnics (like Tom Wolfe), or employ plain prose for clarity and for purity of form matched to subject (like John McPhee) (p.xv).

She provides some defining features that may outline a literary or nonfiction text.

Noticeably, the notion of literature has evolved from being exclusively related to poetry drama and fiction to include nonfiction texts. Nonfiction texts or literary journalism, as some would refer to it, is not a novel genre of literary texts; rather, this storytelling style of writing combines journalistic perspectives with the texture, drama and emotional punch of a novel, thus providing the reader with a fascinating reconstruction of true accounts combined with intriguing detail and weaved with stylistic prose. In his book, *The Art of Creative Nonfiction*, Lee Gutkind (1997) explains that creative nonfiction uses similar techniques as fiction writers and these may include
“dialogue, description, plot, intimacy, and specificity of detail, characterization, and point of view” (p.xix). The only difference he explains is that creative nonfiction is true. Hence, the literary text, Into the Wild, fits within the definition of nonfiction literature and henceforth, in the rest of the chapters in this study, will be referred to as literary text.

This chapter reviewed the theoretical framework that the study drew on, namely the sociocultural perspective of mediation as put forward by Lantolf, in an attempt to situate the study within a larger body of research in the field of second language literacy. The scholarly research reviewed in this chapter forms the basis on which the research questions for the study were developed and informed as well as which guided the data analysis and interpretation. The theoretical perspective which forms the core framework of analysis for the study informs the methodological approach described in the following chapter, Chapter 3. In order to fully comprehend the complexities involved in the navigation of complex academic discursive practices such as source-based writing, it is important to contextualize written academic discourse that situates written interactions within specific institutional, disciplinary and local contexts. The following chapter provides a detailed description of the methodological framework of the study which uses a qualitative multiple-case study approach.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodological framework used to conduct an in-depth investigation of the how three novice multilingual undergraduate writers navigated source-based writing using both literary and nonliterary source texts. In this study, I adopted the theoretical framework of Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of mediation as extended by Lantolf (2000) in order to highlight the role of culturally constructed artifacts that are deployed by students in order to mediate their understanding of academic tasks situated in social and culturally embedded contexts. The research questions that guided this study are exploratory in nature and, therefore, required a research methodology that permitted an in-depth investigation of the deep and multi-faceted reality of the multilingual learners’ academic literacy learning experience of writing from sources. Therefore, the study used a qualitative approach of textual analysis which included elements of ethnographic techniques combined with an analysis of students’ texts to construct a better understanding of the writer’s construction of the text (Swales & Leubs, 1995). Using this approach as a primary analytical tool, the study attempted to answer the broad overarching question:
In a course like English for Academic purposes (EAP) which focused on source-based writing, what is the place of literature to teach research-based writing?

In order to shed light on the broad question, two main research questions that I addressed were:

- How did undergraduate multilingual writers in an EAP course navigate the academic discursive practice of synthesizing texts and integrating both literary and nonliterary texts as source texts into the composition of their research-based writing assignments?
- How did undergraduate multilingual writers respond to literary texts as source texts? To what extent, and how effectively, did they use literary texts as sources compared to nonliterary, information-based source texts?

The first part of this chapter introduces the study’s setting and participants. The focus then shifts to the study’s methodology: the theoretical framework guiding its design, the researcher’s role in the study, the data gathering instruments employed, and the ways in which the data was analyzed. This leads into a discussion of the ethical considerations involved in the collection and analysis of the data.

**Research Context**

**Setting**

The study was conducted in an English as a Second Language (ESL) composition class in a large mid-western land-grant university ranked as a research one institution with campuses and research centers all over the state. According to the statistical summary provided by the university, in autumn of 2012, the precise number of
international students studying in this university was 6,028. The university’s ESL Composition Program started with the objective of assisting international and multilingual students to perform successfully as writers in mainstream courses. It offers a wide variety of courses to both undergraduate and graduate multilingual writers, and, according to its website, is one of the largest post-admission ESL programs in the United States. The specific course explored in this study was EDU T&L 108.01, and the study was conducted in the Spring Quarter of 2010. ESL Composition 108.01 was then a five-credit academic writing course for undergraduate international students. All international students admitted to the university take the ESL Composition placement test, and the students who do not pass the test are placed into one of the three levels of the courses offered by the ESL department at the time of the study (the university has since converted to a semester system involving a new course sequence), as shown in Table 1:
Table 1: Courses Offered by the ESL Composition Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course title</th>
<th>Student Level</th>
<th>Description/skills taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 106</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Introduction to academic writing, basic rhetorical strategies such as summarizing, synthesizing, arguing and understanding plagiarism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 107</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Expressing opinion, organizing discourse, integrating source texts, paraphrasing, summarizing, critical review papers, grammar exercises, reflective writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 108.01</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Incorporating multiple sources to create an argumentative research paper, expanding knowledge on a theme, appropriate use and citation of sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 506</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Summarizing, defining, synthesizing, comparing, arguing and understanding plagiarism, specific grammatical forms and rhetorical strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 507</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Advanced skills in academic writing, descriptive and evaluative summaries of field-specific journal articles, extended definitions of concepts, problem-solution papers, interpretation of data, rhetorical grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 508</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Presenting research findings, evaluating and synthesizing sources, applying genre appropriate conventions, annotated bibliography, critical review of research articles, researching and present a style manual that is discipline-specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU T&amp;L 605.01, 605.02, 605.03</td>
<td>Graduate Level courses</td>
<td>Editing, grammar, style, conference paper preparation, process of publication, grant application, writing manuscripts, preparation of thesis and dissertation proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate multilingual students were placed into one of three levels of the course based on their scores of the placement essay. As seen in Table 1, 108.01 it is the final course in a three-course sequence offered by the ESL composition department for undergraduate multilingual writers. The 108.01 course met three times a week (Monday, Wednesday and Friday) for a total of four hours per week. In addition, the course required students to meet with their instructor for writing conferences at least 3-4 times in
a quarter; each conference was approximately 30 minutes in duration. The course design, theme, and materials were developed by the course coordinator, and, as a Graduate Teaching Assistant assigned to teach a section of the course, I was invited to supplement the course readings with some of my selections. The course used an electronic course packet that included the course description, syllabus, course policies and assigned readings and was posted on the course website. The contents of the course were organized around the components of an academic research paper and included the following text types: Response Paper, Summary, Mini Research Paper, Documentation Styles, and the Long Research Paper. The research paper was broken down into blocks of individual elements such as the research question, reading for research purposes, the thesis, supporting claims with evidence and weaving evidence into the text skillfully, constructing well developed paragraphs, and improving flow throughout the paper. The course also covered grammatical topics such as parallel structures, coordinating conjunctions, transition words, formality of tone, and reporting verbs. The course used a process approach to instruction which allowed students to submit their research paper in drafts and meet with the instructor for a 30-minute individual conference to discuss feedback on their assignments and any challenges they faced.

**Instructional Context**

Understanding the instructional context in which the study was conducted is important as it allows us to examine the variables that may have contributed to findings in this specific context.
The classroom consisted of twenty first-year undergraduate multilingual students from diverse disciplines and countries. After the syllabus was provided in the first lecture, the students were expected to do assigned readings for subsequent lectures and the readings were posted on the course website. The assigned pages for reading the literary text *Into the Wild* were noted on the syllabus systematically week by week. The course used a variety of approaches in combination with one another such as lecture-based instruction, instructional exercises, quizzes, in-class reading activities, vocabulary games, peer feedback, class discussions and group discussions.

Randy and Hyunjin, two of the case study participants, regularly sat at the back of the classroom and Jie, the other case study participant, sat in the first row, right in front. Most of the students were seated in the same location and on the same seats throughout the quarter. Early in quarter, when students were put into groups and asked to discuss the assigned readings, “most of them did not know how and what to discuss, so I went around to each group offering them pointers and facilitating their discussion” (Field notes- April 5, 2010). Each of the groups had both, dynamic and unproductive participants: some students were quiet and contributed minimally while others were engaged and actively shared individual perspectives based on their personal experiences. For example, Randy was active in his group and often added to what other group members contributed; whereas, Jie “seemed quiet in her group with male group members dominating the conversation. However, it seemed like she wanted to participate” (Field Notes- April 5, 2010). Hyunjin was noted as being unproductive in her group (Field notes- April 5, 2010).
As the students became more comfortable with the classroom environment and the instructor, the classroom climate became engaged and lively. Students were not afraid to seek clarification on any points made by the instructor or challenge perspectives that other students presented. Additionally, in individual group discussions and whole classroom discussions, some students who were initially quiet became more actively engaged as the quarter progressed and often raised their hands to participate in discussions. Jie and Randy enthusiastically participated and often volunteered to read and write. For example, while teaching the lesson on paraphrasing, “Randy volunteered to read the excerpt from the text and offered to paraphrase. Jie also suggested ways to paraphrase the text by offering synonyms. However, Hyunjin came across as reserved” (Field notes April 7, 2010).

In many group discussions, students brought their cultural resources and personal experiences to the discussion and the readings. For example, “one student, George, compared events in the reading to cultural experiences in his home country.” (Field Notes- April 5, 2010). Similarly, “Randy discussed his personal beliefs valued in his cultural background with the group and made connections with the reading. He talked about moral goodness and how some people would help others because of their religious upbringing” (Field Notes- April 5, 2010).

On some occasions, students did not always complete the assigned readings especially if the article or chapter was consisted of many pages. In such situations, I would summarize the reading for them in a story-telling format. “Students seemed to enjoy this story-telling and would often repeat my words and descriptions when writing
their reflections” (Field notes- May 19, 2010). Various approaches were used to check student’s reading of the materials assigned. For example, when students were put into groups, they were provided with reading guides to help them better comprehend the assigned text and also, the guides served as a prompt for discussion. On other occasions, students had a short quiz, in which they were asked to write a brief response to the question asked. In some lectures, vocabulary and grammar games such as Pictionary and crosswords from the assigned texts were part of the instructional activity to encourage reading. The students often became excited to work in teams and participated competitively in such games.

Often, students were put in pairs to work on various in-class exercises and these peer sessions seemed to be productive. My field notes indicate that “the classroom was noisy and students talked a lot with each other providing some good feedback” (Field Notes- April 26, 2010). On one such occasion, “Jie asked to be seated with her Chinese friends but agrees to work with the assigned peer. She seems settled on her topic for the Mini Research Paper” (Field Notes- April 26, 2010). Additionally, while working with a peer on his research question, “Randy realized his research question was vague and unclear. His peer had suggested that he modify his research question and provide more details. This peer exercise seemed to be helping him” (Field notes- April 26, 2010). Interestingly, “Hyunjin, when put in a pair to work with a peer, engaged actively and wrote detailed feedback on her peer’s text. This is interesting because she seems more comfortable in pairs than in a group (May, 26, 2010). My field notes indicate that “students did a great job with writing peer feedback” (Field notes- May 26, 2010).
When reflection/response papers were introduced in the course, none of the students knew how to write a response paper or what to include. “Most of them had not heard of a response paper” (Field notes- April 7, 2010). A detailed lesson was conducted to teach students how to write a response paper. When writing individual in-class reflection papers in the computer lab, “Hyunjin often typed quickly and seemed to have a plan for what she wanted to write. Randy used a lot of emotive words in his response papers. Jie seemed to be struggling writing the response paper, and with making and supporting her claims. She found it easier to summarize and was typing slowly (Field notes - May 7, 2010).

On the whole, the instructional context was dynamic and conducive to learning, which seemed to be evident from student’s participation and motivation to learn. Students were encouraged to participate and bring their cultural resources into the learning environment. The social interaction between the instructor and students and between students was strong as was the rapport.

**Case Study Participants**

The case study participants were undergraduate multilingual students enrolled in the ESL Composition 108.01 course. The selection of participants was framed by my research questions, and due to the qualitative nature of this study, purposeful sampling seemed to be the most appropriate sampling. “Purposive sampling is based on the assumption that one wants to discover, understand, gain insight; therefore one needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most” (Merriam, 1988, p. 48). Upon receiving permission from the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) to conduct this study, I introduced my study to the class and, in keeping with the tenets of qualitative
research, purposeful and homogenous sampling (Patton, 1990) was initially used, as the students in the course all shared some common characteristics, such as: they were all multilingual students and had all taken the ESL placement test and placed into the course. Hence, all of the 20 students in the class were offered the option to fill out a one-page questionnaire if they were interested in participating in the study (See Appendix C). The purpose of the questionnaire was to get a sense of student’s prior reading experiences in English and to gain insight into student’s existing beliefs about literature and its possible impact on their writing. The questionnaire elicited information such as their gender, native country, native language, major and number of novels (in English) read, and included questions such as whether they enjoyed reading literature in their native language and in the English language, if they believed reading literature would improve their writing, and the genre of books they usually enjoyed reading.

As a graduate teaching assistant in the program, my previous experience of having taught the course provided me with a deeper and richer understanding of the culture of a multilingual academic writing classroom in addition to the purpose of the course. The set of criteria for selection of participants was based on my research question and the nature of the study and assisted by my prior experience with the course. These were: (1) enrollment at the university (2) enrollment in the ESL writing course (3) willingness to participate in the study and be audio-taped and (4) a multilingual international student. Potential participants for the study were selected using Patton’s “maximum sampling variation” (Patton, 1990), which refers to the selection of participants by focusing on heterogeneity along with some participant selection criteria.
These were based on different nationalities, linguistic and cultural background, reading and writing experiences and educational majors. Given that the students in the course comprised of multilingual writers that came from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, maximum variation sampling was chosen to help minimize the limitations of the study so that the findings can be applied across a larger range of second language writers and not to a particular culture.

Patton (1990) states that “when selecting a small sample of great diversity, the data collection and analysis will yield two kinds of findings: 1) high quality detailed descriptions of each case, which are useful for documenting uniqueness and 2) important shared patterns that cut across cases and derive their significance from having emerged out of heterogeneity” (p.172). The results of the initial questionnaire suggested that few students had prior experience reading literature in English, and most of them disliked the idea of reading a literary text in English. After reading through all of the survey responses, I short-listed about eight participants in an attempt to enable maximum sample variation. Based on the aforementioned criteria and their survey responses, I purposefully selected (Patton, 1990) the final three case study participants from a range of diverse backgrounds and literature reading experiences in order to choose “information-rich cases” (Patton, 1990, p.169). Table 2 provides an overview of the participants.
Table 2: Focal Participants’ Backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jie</th>
<th>Randy</th>
<th>Hyunjin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of origin</strong></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages spoken</strong></td>
<td>Chinese, English</td>
<td>Indonesian, Javanese, English</td>
<td>Korean, English, Chinese (minimal), Japanese (minimal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of literary texts read in English</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of time in America</strong></td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>2½ years</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoys reading literature in native language</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the Table 2 above, the participants were culturally and linguistically diverse with varying reading experiences in English. While Hyunjin had extensive reading experience, the other two participants had read less than five novels in English at the time of the study. The participants hailed from various disciplines in the university and majored in Communication, Architecture, and Math. It was decided to conduct multiple case studies to enable cross-case analyses that would provide a rich context for the phenomena under study. As long as the participants were representative of the group under study, i.e. undergraduate multilingual writers in an L2 context, and met the criteria for selection, there was no fixed criterion for the number of participants. Susan R. Jones (2002) points this out in her article “Methodological Strategies and Issues” by stating “because the focus of qualitative research is on depth, the emphasis is
rarely on sheer numbers of participants” (p.465). In this study, and as can be seen in the table above, a minimum sample of three cases was selected to provide “reasonable coverage of the phenomenon” under study (Patton, 1990).

As an instructor for the course in the previous quarters, although the research context was familiar, the participants in this study were a new group of students with whom I had to build a rapport. As with any course, the rapport-building process is facilitated with the progress of the quarter; time spent with the students in the course was the only way to gain an entry into their world of reading and writing. Once participants were selected, my main goal was to build a relationship based on trust and mutual respect. My research objectives as well as their rights and responsibilities as participants in my research were openly stated in the recruitment letter (Appendix A) and the Consent for the Participation form (Appendix B). Reciprocity is an essential condition of qualitative research which implies “a give and take, a mutual negotiation of meaning and power” (Lather, 1986 p.263) and has been found to create an environment which generates rich data (Lather, 1986 p.263). As a form of reciprocity for their participation, I offered to be a face-to-face writing consultant for the following three quarters after the study to offer any guidance on their written assignments in other courses. Electronic communication was offered as an option, too, if they needed assistance in the form of feedback on their written assignments in other courses. For example, I offered to help students interpret the prompt of an assignment in some of their other courses. My experiences as a writing instructor and writing center consultant familiarized me with guiding students on their written work. The participants appreciated this opportunity and
gladly participated in my study. One of the participants Jie emailed me to thank me for selecting her, as she believed she would improve her English from participating and interacting with a native speaker.

As the course progressed, all three participants (Jie, Randy and Hyunjin) seemed to feel comfortable around me as a teacher and as a researcher. They were open and honest about their struggles with adjusting to life on campus in a new culture, in a new language, and in a classroom setting which was remarkably different from classrooms in their home countries. As a resident of the city and a student at the university myself, I was able to share cultural information about activities at the university and in the city it was located in. I became their cultural informant, and the participants felt like they could count on me as a resource during their journey as first year students in a city and culture that was foreign to them. Thus, we established a strong rapport, and this kind of relationship was a valuable resource during the data gathering for the study, as the participants were more open to sharing with me important information about their writing-related experiences in the course.

**Qualitative Case Study Design and Rationale**

**Guiding Framework**

The research approach adopted in this study used a postpositivist inquiry, which posits that reality is socially constructed and “related to the perspective from which we are looking” (Green & Stinson, 1999, p. 93). Postpositivist research brought about a huge change in perspective, specifically, in educational research, since it allowed us to view social reality in a much more flexible manner (Lather, 1991). An important goal of postpositivist researchers is to understand the specific research context, and in doing so...
seek out multiple perspectives and meanings; hence, the interpretations a researcher makes within this paradigm are constantly being constructed and reconstructed (Green & Stinson, 1999). As mentioned above, the goal of this study was to shed light on the how three first-year multilingual academic writers negotiated elements of source-based writing by looking at how they performed on writing tasks (i.e., research papers) that involved the use of both literary and nonliterary sources. Through this study, I hoped to develop insights into how novice writers navigate and negotiate elements of source-based writing by considering not only their written texts but also by obtaining multiple perspectives on how they learned the processes involved in academic reading and writing. This emic perspective of the multilingual writer’s experiences was best constructed through a postpositivist inquiry that sought multiple perspectives and meanings. Table 3 below represents the perspectives used in the design of this study.

Table 3: Green and Stinson’s (1999) Framework of Postpositivist Inquiry Used in this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontology (Nature of Reality)</th>
<th>Epistemology (Nature of knowledge)</th>
<th>Methodology (How do obtain knowledge?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socially constructed</td>
<td>Subjectivity unavoidable</td>
<td>Interpretations are constructed and reconstructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple realities</td>
<td>Selects data and determines what is important to the research context.</td>
<td>Emergent nature of research design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The researcher attempts to understand or interpret a research context</td>
<td>General procedures for data collection and analysis may provide parameters but the researcher is open to patterns and meanings that are appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks multiple perspectives and meanings</td>
<td>Variety of methods not limited to observation, interviews, document analysis and participant observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Created from Green and Stinson’s (1999, pp. 93-95) article, “Postpositivist Research in Dance.”
Thus, a qualitative research method is useful in constructing a rich picture of the complexities involved in navigating academic discursive practices, because it allows us to answer “how” and “why” questions, which were the kinds of questions addressed in this study. Research within this paradigm requires using an emic approach involving prolonged contact and immersion in the field. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994), “qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive naturalistic approach to its subject matter” (p. 2) and includes “empirical assertions, narrative vignettes and quotations from observational field notes, and interviews, interpretive commentary, theoretical discussions and a description of the research process itself” (Erickson, 1986, p. 146). Using a qualitative approach allowed me to capture the experiences and perspectives of novice multilingual writers in a natural setting while they attempted to learn the discourse of the academy. As Hatch (2002, p. 7) noted, “in qualitative work, the intent is to explore human behaviors within the contexts of their natural occurrence”; similarly, through a qualitative inquiry, I was able to observe and understand the academic literacy learning process of multilingual students as they engaged with a variety of source texts and grappled with the challenges of learning the complex discursive practices connected with source-based writing.

**Case Study Approach**

The qualitative case study approach has been considered to be productive and influential in applied linguistics research, particularly in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research (Duff, 2008), since it provides an opportunity to produce knowledge through a “detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context” (Creswell, 1998, p. 61). According to Merriam (1988 p.13), case studies
investigate a “contextualized contemporary phenomenon within specified boundaries,”
the boundaries being “a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution or a social
group” (p.13). Especially in SLA research, case studies have the potential to capture a
naturalistic view of the complexities that exist in the process of acquiring academic literacy learning. Zamel (1983), in her classic study of the writing of advanced ESL students suggests that case study is "the most effective way to examine the writing process" (p. 169). Moreover, in her book, Writing Games: Multicultural Case Studies of Academic Literacy Practices in Higher Education, Christine Casanave (2002) presents a series of cases that document the struggles that novice writers encounter while trying to become academic writers. She argues that “case studies provide multiple perspectives that enable a fuller understanding of the social forces at work” (p.1).

This study employed a multiple case study approach (Miles and Huberman, 1984) where the focus of inquiry was on three participants. Each of the participant cases were considered to be unique and “an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity” (Merriam 1988 p.16). The use of multiple cases allowed me to uncover multiple realities and, therefore, enabled me to illuminate potential challenges the novice multilingual writers encountered while learning academic discursive practices. To ensure trustworthiness of data and to allow the diversity and complexities of each case experience to emerge, both within and cross-case analyses were performed. Multiple case studies provide “much potential for both greater explanatory power and greater generalizability than a single case study can deliver” (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 152). The current study used case analyses to provide a rich interpretive account of
multilingual writers and their response to literary and nonliterary source-based writing, thus allowing for a delineation of the complexities associated with learning academic literacy practices.

**Ethnographic Approach to Text Analysis**

To capture the various features of novice multilingual writers’ academic literacy journey, an important consideration was what kind of inquiry should be conducted. Although classroom observations and recordings have offered tremendous insight into second language learning processes, several scholars are now calling for more text-based interaction studies in second language research (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Harklau, 2002; Leki, 1995, 1999; Paltridge, 2008; Prior, 1995; Spack, 1997; Swales, 1998).

Swales (1998) puts forth a naturalistic method of data collection called “textography” in which he attempts to contextualize written academic discourse that situates written interactions within specific institutional, disciplinary, and local contexts. Going beyond text itself and analyzing the context in which the texts are produced (Freedman, 1999; Johns, 1997) can provide a more contextualized view of how texts are constructed in a multilingual setting. Thus, combining elements of ethnographic approaches such as participant observation and interviewing to provide detailed descriptions of the context, with an analysis of students’ written texts to reach a better understanding of how and why the texts are constructed as they are provides a “situated and contextualized” (Swales & Leubs, 1995) view of the topic under inquiry.

Particularly, ethnographic approaches to analyzing academic texts are emerging in the field of academic writing (Flowerdew, 2002). Flowerdew highlights the nature of this emerging research approach by positing that an ethnographic perspective allows for the
examination of ways in which academic writing tasks are conceptualized by students and teachers within the context of an educational setting, by taking into account not only significant texts and practices, but also the perspectives of different participants.

Accordingly, an ethnographic perspective includes direct observation, interview, and other modes of analyzing the situational context in addition to textual analysis.

Beaugrande (1984) advises us that we cannot isolate the production of text from the processes used to produce it. Thus, rather than looking at the final product or text that is produced, I sought to investigate the process and context in which it was produced.

Quite a few scholars have employed methods that are similar to textography, to explore the “situatedness of written texts” (Paltridge, 2004, 2007; Prior, 1998; Swales, 1998a, 1998b; Thesen, 1997). In his book, Other Floors, Other Voices, Swales (1998a) investigated the kinds of writing people engaged in on three different floors of his university building using textography as a methodology. Using observations, document analysis, and interviews, he attempted to understand the purpose of those kinds of texts and assembled textual life histories of seven people in the building. Through interviews, he found that each of the writer’s academic and professional histories influenced the nature of the texts they constructed. Through this study, Swales introduced the idea of “place discourse community” and pointed out that the university and the building could not be seen as a single discourse community.

Other studies that used similar methodological approaches include Thesen (1997), who analyzed biographical interviews of 13 first year students in a South African university to investigate the dynamics of their identity construction. Through their
biographical interviews, she sought to investigate the discrepancy between the institutional categories that identified students and way the students described themselves. To capture this tension, she used a simultaneously linguistic (when referring to a discourse analysis of an essay) and ethnographic (biographical interviews combined with interviews) approach to “reach a better understanding of who the writers are and what their linguistic choices mean” (p.494). She found that through the interviews, the students offered accounts of emerging identities across different contexts and often discussed transitioning from their previous experiences to formal academic literacy contexts. Similarly, Prior (1998) attempted to develop situated case studies of writing and disciplinary practices and used an ethnographic approach to study the academic texts of a group of multicultural, multilingual, and multidisciplinary undergraduate and graduate students in a seminar course and provided a series of case studies of writing that were thickly described and contextually detailed. He suggests viewing writing as “the confluence of many streams of activity: reading, talking, observing, acting, making, thinking and feeling as well as transcribing words on paper” (p. xi).

In this study, I used a text-oriented ethnography which relied on student interviews, a thick description (Geertz, 2007) of context, and fine-grained analysis of student’s written artifacts to understand how participants negotiated their way into academic discursive practices of using a combination of literary and nonliterary source texts to compose their own texts. The main purpose for using this qualitative analytical approach was to capture the “contextualization and situatedness” (Swales, 1998a) of written texts that were composed from multiple source texts by novice multilingual
writers. Moreover, it allowed me to examine written texts in conjunction with interviews “in order to get an inside view of the worlds in which the texts are written, why the texts are written as they are, what guides the writing, and the values that underlie the texts that have been written” (Katz, 1999, cited in Paltridge, 2007, p. 149). Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) point out that every research perspective “produces a particular understanding of the phenomenon under study” (p. 153). Other analytical methods, such as content analysis and rhetorical analysis, tend to focus more on the linguistic features of the text and the appeals and techniques used in the text to persuade the reader and may not account for situational contexts in which the text was produced. By offering a situated view of genre and going beyond the text into the social and cultural context surrounding the genre, an ethnographic analysis of contexts in which the text was produced allows us to factor in the participant’s views on text production. Observing and analyzing contextual conditions of text production provided important insights into preferred patterns of interaction and challenges multilingual novice writers encountered in accessing and processing academic discourse (Flowerdew, 2002).

**Role of Teacher-Researcher**

The postpositivist tradition has not only extended and validated various frameworks of inquiry that seek to challenge a dominant social reality, but also has legitimized the source of knowledge as socially constructed (Lather, 1991). This paradigm has thus reconceptualized the role of teachers in the classroom and has enabled teachers to become “knowledge creators” by legitimizing teacher knowledge, thereby challenging the traditional disciplinary research that dominates most language teacher
education (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). This new scholarship has the potential to essentially transform the knowledge base, which traditionally guides most teacher education programs, from being “outsider” and objective knowledge to “insider” knowledge that teachers possess as locals to the settings that they are immersed in (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1998; Johnson & Golombek, 2002). Specifically, in the L2 context of an academic writing classroom, I was uniquely situated to observe and inquire about the processes involved in the learning of research-based writing, since I was the instructor for the 108.01 course that served as the research site as well the researcher. As a teacher/researcher, my role was that of an “observant participant” (Erickson, 1986) which highlighted my position of an already established member of the classroom who took on the role of an observer. Therefore, by asking relevant questions, teachers can gain insights into their student’s academic practices that may result in improved educational practices which, according to Hooks (1994), is “the embodiment of engaged pedagogy” (p.110, cited in Smagorinsky, 2006).

While qualitative researchers seek to immerse themselves into their research settings to make the strange familiar (Burns & Groves, 2003), as the instructor for the course, I positioned myself as an insider to the research setting. My familiarity with the course content, the research setting, and my previous experiences as an instructor of the 108.01 course made me a legitimate member of the research setting, and this served as a vantage point from which I could explore the rich and varied experiences of my student’s academic literacy learning process. In this regard, I brought to the research an emic
perspective as I attempted to understand how participants made sense of the various texts they engaged with during the process of learning research-based writing.

However, tensions are inherent when assuming the dual role of teacher and researcher. For example, performing normal duties as the teacher and researcher simultaneously proved to be difficult in actual practice. Baird and Northfield (1992) refer to this as one of the persistent trials of teacher-research. Specifically, as the teacher of the class, I often struggled with making extensive field notes as I tended to focus more on teaching and delivering lecture modules. Separating the role of teacher and researcher, at the data collection stage did not seem to be so as complex as it was during the data analysis stage. Preventing the two roles from overlapping was particularly challenging, at the time of analyzing and interpreting the data. My subjectivity did permeate the interpretation of my data which made data analysis fairly challenging in its initial stage. To minimize this, I sought the help of “critical friends” to review the interpretation of my findings and prevent one role from overlapping with the other. Nonetheless, my privilege of being affiliated with the academic institution as the instructor for the course positions me as an outsider to my research participants, thus making the insider-outsider question fairly complex (Grove, 2003). However, as Erickson (1993) points out “neither the outsider nor the insider is granted immaculate perception” (p. ix).

**Data Collection Methods**

Given the naturalistic setting of the qualitative nature of this study and the research questions it addressed, data were collected from multiple sources, primarily
from participant artifacts such as journals and course documents, transcriptions from student-instructor conferences, interviews, field notes, and videotaping of class sessions. The selection of data collection methods was based on the “phenomenon under investigation, research questions and theoretical perspective” (Jones, 2002, p. 171). Erickson (1986) advises us to make the process of data collection as deliberative as possible; hence, “framing research questions explicitly and seeking relevant data deliberately enable and power intuition, rather than stifle it” (p.140). Contextual information on each of the primary data sources is provided below:

1. **Journals**- Participant journals functioned as a primary data source in this study. Participants were asked to keep a journal to record their feelings and opinions about various aspects of the reading and writing process and the assignments in general; in particular, they were to record and reflect on any challenges they encountered with using source texts and the literary text *Into the Wild*. Initially, the journals were unstructured, but later, I provided prompts to elicit information specific to my research questions and give students a more focused approach to documenting their experiences (See Appendix D on p.270 for structured journal prompt). The journals were limited to one page each week, and the participants wrote 7 journal entries.

2. **Course Artifacts**- Four types of course-related documents were collected for the purpose of this study: Writing assignments, reading materials, electronic interactions, and questionnaires. Students brought these artifacts to the tutorial sessions, and these sometimes served to elicit specific questions during the
interviews. The documents were promptly photocopied and returned to the participants. In addition to 7 journal entries, each student submitted 6 reflection papers, 2 research papers, one summary paper, and their reading materials. I also collected their email exchanges between instructor and student. For example, if a participant emailed the instructor with a query regarding the MR or LRP, that email was printed and considered a data source relevant to the study.

3. **Questionnaire** - The questionnaire given to participants at the beginning of the study constituted the only questionnaire in the study. The purpose was to get a sense of student’s prior reading experiences in English and to gain insight into student’s existing beliefs about literature and its possible impact on their writing (See Appendix C on p.269). The questionnaire elicited information such as their gender, native country, native language, major and number of novels (in English) read, and included questions such as whether they enjoyed reading literature in their native language and in the English language, if they believed reading literature would improve their writing, and the genre of books they usually enjoyed reading. This questionnaire was filled out in class and returned at the end of the lecture.

4. **Student-Instructor conferences /Interviews** - Another source of data collection was the tutorial sessions, which were regularly scheduled one-to-one writing conferences held to discuss feedback or assist with drafts. I met with each participant four times for approximately 30-35 minutes each time over the course of ten weeks. As part of the natural discourse of the tutorial, the discussion
centered mostly on the participant’s written drafts, the processes involved in the construction of the draft, and the instructor’s written feedback. These tutorials doubled up as the site of interviews and hence, a combination of structured and unstructured questions was used. That is, the tutorials provided an opening opportunity to discuss the students’ writing, while the interviews allowed for meaningful follow-up on issues arising during the tutorials. Because there was a complementary relationship between the objectives and conduct of the tutorials and interviews, it was felt that they would work best in combination rather than as separate occasions. Effective pursuit of points arising during the tutorials might have been lost if they had to be postponed until a separately scheduled interview was held. The decision to use unstructured interviews was because “Unstructured interviews can provide a greater breadth of data than other types” (Fontana & Frey, 2000 p.652). Open-ended discussions allowed some fascinating details to emerge that would not have been addressed by planned structured questions.

Semi-structured interviews were also used in the study to obtain other kinds of data necessary relevant to the research questions (for an example of a semi-structured interview protocol, see Appendix E on p.271). For instance, there was a background information type of interview with all three participants that had to be somewhat structured in order to glean information about such important aspects as their reading and writing practices, how they navigated literacy demands in other courses, previous academic literacy experiences they’d had.
Subsequent interview questions that were structured stemmed from the participant’s journal data and artifacts. For example, if their journal entries included comments that warranted further questions, the questions were included in these semi-structured interviews. During the data collection phase, I scanned through the data looking for patterns in each of the cases to help shape future interview questions; hence, each interview and artifact elicited a potentially new set of interview/journal questions.

All tutorials were audio-recorded in the least obtrusive way. Field notes were made during and after the tutorial sessions; these notes helped in the identification of initial patterns that featured in the data and thus assisted data analysis.

5. **Transcripts** – In qualitative research, for the interview data to be useful, it needs to be transcribed, and the act of choosing a segment to transcribe implies decisions that involve a series of interpretive processes; hence, transcribing is an interpretive process and a representational process (Green et. al., 1997). Tutorials sessions were audio-recorded and transcribed immediately in detail after the interviews and these transcripts were then used to conduct member checks with participants. “One of the ways in which researchers can check their own subjectivity and ensure the trustworthiness of their findings …is through member checking (Jones, 2002 p.173). The participants were given a copy of the transcript with preliminary interpretations in order to later verify their accuracy by editing, clarifying or elaborating on their comments. Due to insufficient time in
transcribing interviews towards the end of the quarter, some member checks were
conducted electronically well after the data were collected.

6. **Field notes** are an important feature of participant-observation, as they allow the
researcher to capture important details or events that take place at that given time.
Field notes are raw data that provide additional meaning to other data collected.
Erickson (1986) asserts that “there is no substitute for the reflection during
fieldwork that comes from time spent with the original field notes, writing them
up in a more complete form, with analytic insights recorded in them” (p.144).
Field notes made during every class and tutorial session in a notebook and were
open-ended. They recorded my observations, feelings, beliefs and assumptions
regarding the classroom and my interaction with my participants. These notes
allowed me to collect impressions of “researcher subjectivity” or what Peshkin
(1988 p.18) calls situational subjectivity.”

7. **Videotaping** as a data collection strategy in qualitative research allowed me to
capture the social context of the classroom and contents of the course. The
videotaped data were not transcribed and were referred to only for the purpose of
reviewing course content, and refreshing my memory to fill in field notes. The
first week of class was not video recorded to accommodate diagnostics,
recruitment of participants and computer lab orientation however all other class
sessions were video-recorded. 
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To generate a better sense of how data collection took place during the study (running a total of around three months), Table 4 on the following page presents the data sources and the weekly timeline of data collected during the 108.01 course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Types of Data</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Diagnostics Data Sheet</td>
<td>-To determine proficiency -Student data required by dept – writing courses, major, length of time in the U.S. -To find out the number of novels read and the general perception of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Electronic (Carmen)</td>
<td>Online Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Reflection paper 1 Participant journal #1</td>
<td>Course assignment &amp; structured journal to record feelings and struggles about reading and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Classroom lesson for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Tutorial meeting with participants audio recorded</td>
<td>Unstructured/semi-structured Transcribed notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Reflection paper 2 Participant journal # 2 In-class written work</td>
<td>-Structured personal journal -Source texts-related class work (Q&amp;A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Classroom lesson for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Reflection paper 3 Participant journal # 3 In-class written work</td>
<td>Structured personal journal Source texts-related class work (Q&amp;A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Classroom lesson for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Participant journal #4 In-class written work</td>
<td>Structured personal journal Mini Research Paper outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Classroom lesson for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Tutorial meeting with participants audio recorded</td>
<td>Unstructured/semi-structured Transcribed notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Data Collection Sources and Timeline
Table 4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Types of Data</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Reflection paper 4 Summary Midterm assignment</td>
<td>-Related to source text -Mini Research Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Tutorial meeting with participants audio recorded</td>
<td>Unstructured/semi-structured Transcribed notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Classroom lesson for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Reflection paper 5 Participant journal # 5 Online writing forum Final paper outline</td>
<td>-Structured personal journal -Discussions related to writing the mini-research paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Classroom lesson for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Tutorial meeting with participants audio recorded</td>
<td>Unstructured/semi-structured Transcribed notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Reflection paper 6 Participant journal # 6</td>
<td>Structured personal journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Classroom lesson for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Tutorial meeting with participants audio recorded</td>
<td>Unstructured/semi-structured Transcribed notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Participant journal #7 Final paper assignment</td>
<td>-Structured personal journal -Initial draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>Video-recording</td>
<td>Classroom lesson for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Tutorial meeting with participants audio recorded</td>
<td>Unstructured/semi-structured Transcribed notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Types of Data</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Response to the use of literature survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final paper assignment</td>
<td>Long Research Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-Observation</td>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Description of events, reminders, interesting situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Tutorial meeting with participants audio</td>
<td>Unstructured/semi-structured Transcribed notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the data sources listed in the table assisted with the triangulation of data sources, which is discussed in the next subsection of this chapter.

**Data Analysis**

In congruence with the tenets of qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), an interpretive, inductive approach in my treatment of the data was adopted. Materials collected during fieldwork such as personal journals, course artifacts, interview transcripts, audio-recordings, and field notes are not data until they are analyzed to become data through a systematic analysis, according to Erickson (1986), who explains that materials gathered are converted into data only “through some formal means of analysis” (p.149). The current study used thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998) that focused on identifiable patterns in the data through careful reading. Since case study data analysis generally involves an iterative, spiraling, or cyclical process (Creswell, 1998), I used the research questions that framed my study to guide my analysis process, since this allowed me to focus only on relevant data that assisted my inquiry. Additionally, multiple theoretical perspectives such as
reading-writing connections (Hirvela, 2001), sociocultural perspectives (Vygotsky, 1978) and Lea and Street’s (2000) Academic Literacies perspective guided the interpretation process. Initially a “within-case analysis” (Merriam 1998) was performed, but once categories/themes started to emerge, a cross-case analysis (Yin, 2003) was performed. Hence, the data during the analysis process was initially “subdivided” but later presented in a “consolidated picture” (Creswell, 2002). Since my focus was on three individual cases with three unique stories, the data analysis process benefitted from the emerging and flexible nature of qualitative research design, which enabled me to capture the rich details of each individual case. Creswell (2007) explains that “there is not one single way to analyze qualitative data- it is an eclectic process in which you try to make sense of the information” (p.258). Thus, the approaches to analysis of qualitative data will vary considerably.

To analyze the data, systematic methods of analysis were used and the iterative phases of analysis performed in this study is represented in Figure 2 below:
Recursive process of qualitative data analysis used in this study

Reading, re-reading, and reflecting followed by broad preliminary interpretations

Linking themes together to create categories

Assigning codes to text segments

Refinement of themes based on research questions

Generation of potential patterns/themes based on codes and RQ

Reading, reflecting and broad interpretations

As mentioned earlier, my goal in this research was to examine how the participants navigated the academic discursive practice of integrating literary and nonliterary texts as source texts into the composition of their research-based writing assignments. As Creswell (2002) notes, analyzing qualitative data is primarily inductive. Hence, in applying this approach to my analysis, the data was read through initially to develop a general sense, and the research questions were a guiding tool throughout the reading process. The reading-through process included specific data sets such as participant journals, response papers, the Mini and Long Research Papers, transcriptions (from tutorial interviews), field notes, and other artifacts. It is important to note that the analysis process is iterative in qualitative research (Creswell, 1998) and hence, data was
closely read through multiple times to allow for reading and reflecting, exploring and noting descriptions and making some broad preliminary interpretations.

Assigning codes to text segments
As I re-read the datasets, I assigned preliminary codes to various text segments to make sense of the data. These working codes assisted in managing and breaking down the extensive dataset. For example, Creswell (2007) suggests “writing memos in the margins of field notes, transcripts...helps in the initial process of exploring data” (p.265). The journals that the participants maintained were one of the sources for these codes. For example, as I initially read through Jie’s journals, I made several marginal notes highlighting her challenges with reading, her self-critical attitude, reading strategies she used, passion for the literary text, personal connection with the text and many more (See Data Codes Appendix F). These were examples of coded text segments within one case across different journal entries. A similar process was applied to the other numerous data sources, and most of the codes written accurately described the meaning of the text segment and represented the participant’s way of thinking about various academic literacy practices.

Sample of coding

Below is an illustration of coding of a sample journal entry made by one of the participants, Jie.

Journal # 1- April 23, 2010

On the Wednesday class, most of us sketched topics for the mini research paper. I am not sure whether I have written this kind of paper before. I mean when I was in the university back
in China, we did write papers. But the topics were given by the professors. We had no need to consider about it by ourselves. As for me, however, I really cannot agree with that those topics require any researches. I know it is definitely not an honor to talk about this, but I always consider the academic circumstance in China is kind of terrible, especially in universities. From the professors to students, there is an atmosphere like plagiarism and treating a research as the springboard of promotion spread widely. It is hard to find a person who is dedicated in the academic staffs. Of course, no one can deny that we can find this kind of person, but it is hardly to find a person who settles such pure achievement in his/her life. About the mini research paper, I plan to write something about how the literature works impact the teenage. According to the novel, Into the Wild, Christopher McCandless seemed to be influenced by the works of Tolstoy and Jack London deeply. I am curious about it, especially about that why Chris would pursue a life style which was very close to vagrancy, and was there any association with these books. I think everyone wants to live a free and independent life, and absolutely there are a lot people have read the books written by this kind of authors. However, Chris chose
a special way to realize this dream. We can say he had the courage the ordinary people did not have.

As can be seen in the underlined phrases above taken from Jie’s journal, several comments she made in her journal entry were coded by researcher in the early stages of analysis as memo notes that had potential to develop into categories. For example, Jie starts off her journal entry stating her lack of experience with the specific genre of writing the research paper; hence, this was coded as “limited text experience.” It could also be seen as her attempt to reflect on her current abilities as a writer of English; hence, it was also coded as “self-reflection.” Similarly, in the following sentences, Jie discusses the academic context of her previous literacy experiences as a university student in China and specifically, discusses how assignments were handed to students. Hence this was coded as “comparison of home country differences in written assignments.” Later on, she also addresses how rules for assignments differed in her home country, China; hence the code “differences in writing rules.” The latter half of her journal entry demonstrates her motivation towards the upcoming assignment and her excitement about the literary text Into the Wild. Not only does she state her plan for the assignment, but she also begins an analysis of the main character in the text to justify her topic for the assignment. Hence these points were coded as “planning in advance” and “analysis of the text.”

**Generation of potential patterns/categories**

Upon labeling text segments with codes in different datasets, I sought to group together codes that formed a pattern. Some of the interpretations I sought were constantly constructed and reconstructed based on the data and guided by the research questions. For
example, in text segments across the various datasets of Jie’s case, coded portions were labeled as struggle with reading, struggle with researching sources, problems with organizing text, time management issues, and struggle with APA citation. These codes were “aggregated together to form a major idea” (Creswell, 2007 p.271) which I identified as challenges. Hence, I came up with a broad umbrella category called “challenges while learning discursive practices.” (See Data Codes and Categories in Appendix F). Any categorical construction from the raw data used multiple sources to determine its credibility. The re-examination of the various patterns and categories was carefully studied to look for any links. The research question became a tool to discern if the patterns and categories found the data were plausible for the purpose of this study.

**Refinement of categories**

As part of the analysis, I read through participant artifacts, including interview transcripts, regularly to identify patterns in each case and group them under major categories. Data analysis in qualitative research is a recursive process (Creswell, 2007); hence, the categories that were established were continually refined to account for the data as new patterns emerged. For example, multiple sources of data such as journals, response papers, the research papers, and interview transcripts from each case study participant were triangulated and used to establish categories which were repeatedly refined. Triangulation refers to the process of using various sources of data to validate findings and increase the overall validity of the study. This form of data triangulation allowed me to prove or disprove initial interpretations. Additionally, categories that seemed conflicting or inconsistent were also identified (Green & Stinson, 1999) and visited throughout the analysis process. To aid my analysis, several published qualitative
research works relating to data analytical procedures were consulted, specifically those by Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1988; Miles & Huberman, 1994; and Patton, 1990, while the theoretical perspectives employed in this study also guided the analysis.

**Linking categories through an interpretive stance**
As the data analysis process moved from concrete to more abstract categories, data was color-coded according to the categories identified, and the coding system was continually being modified as new category themes emerged (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). All data sources, including participant artifacts, transcripts from interviews, field notes and questionnaire data were reviewed and re-visited to establish evidence for the assertions/themes. Campbell (1978) argues that “the aim is to persuade the audience that an adequate evidentiary warrant exists for the assertions made, that patterns of generalization within the data set are indeed as the researcher claims they are” (cf. Erickson, 1986, p.149). This process of reading/reviewing data, coding data, and selecting categories was repeated.

A reasonable basis for interpreting each category/theme is essential to determining the validity of that theme and the validity of the study on the whole. Janesick (2000) points out that “simply observing and interviewing do not ensure that the research is qualitative; the qualitative researcher must also interpret the beliefs and behaviors of participants” (p.387). Using an interpretivist stance, I specifically made selections from the data that echoed the voices of my case study participants and that contributed to my investigation. Green and Stinson (1999) posit that interpretive researchers can be the voice of silent participants, and due to the fact that the researchers make important decisions of what to include in the analysis, readers and the researchers should not forget
that a particular interpretation is only one of the many possible interpretations. Finally, the findings represented in the texts written by qualitative researchers stand as “testaments to the facts of our existence, to our having ‘been there’ and to the many voices of the individuals with whom we have interacted” (Lincoln, 1997 p.47 cited in Jones, 2002 p.468).

The term fine-grained analysis is commonly used in ethnographic research to indicate a close examination of moment to moment interactions taking place at the time of the study. It is usually used in conjunction with micro-ethnographic approaches that seek to probe deeply into face to face interactions within specific contexts (Hatch, 2002). Throughout the study, I performed a fine-grained analysis of the data gathered, which included participant’s personal journals, course artifacts, interview transcripts and their reading materials. By fine grained, I refer to a close analysis of the texts in question. A good example of this type of analysis is the frequency count of literary and nonliterary citations in each of the participant’s Mini Research and Long Research Paper. By looking closely at their texts, I was able to extract how frequently they used both types of texts to support their argument. Fine grained analysis allows researchers focus intensively on a specific set of data that may be significant to the study.

An important aspect of interpreting data that needs to be mentioned is what Strauss and Corbin (1990) characterize as “theoretical sensitivity” of the researcher. By theoretical sensitivity, they refer to “the personal quality of the researcher. It indicates an awareness of the subtleties of meaning of data. ...[It] refers to the attribute of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand, and capability to
separate the pertinent from that which isn't (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 42). My interpretation of the data and decisions made in this study were informed by second language learning theories and academic literacy perspectives in addition to my review of scholarly qualitative case study literature.

**Ethical Considerations**

A good qualitative study is one that follows ethical codes. In discussing issues of site entry and of research ethics, Erickson (1986) suggests two basic ethical principles be followed: (a) research subjects should be informed of the purposes and activities of the research and of any additional work load or burden that may accompany the research in addition to any risks that may apply by being studied; (b) the subjects being studied need to be protected as much as possible from any risks involved, and it is the researcher’s responsibility to anticipate the range of risks that may be involved for those being studied. By following these guidelines, Erickson states that trust and rapport can follow, which in turn can minimize deception and faking. My study followed the university’s ethical research guidelines (IRB) to ensure that sound research practices were carried out. In this study, a recruitment letter articulating the details of the study, the time-line, the role of the researcher and participant rights and responsibilities was provided to the participants, (see Appendix A on p.266) and if they chose to participate, they were asked to sign an informed consent for participation form (see Appendix B on p.267).

An important aspect of the ethical domain of research is credibility. *Credibility*, according to Lather (1993), is defined as “the extent to which the data, data analysis, and conclusions are believable and trustworthy as based on a set of standard practices”
Also, “Telling the stories that emerge from an evolving research design is a process that carries great responsibility and the need for integrity, honesty and rigorous analytic procedures” (Jones, 2002, p.467). Lincoln and Guba (1985) put forth techniques to establish trustworthiness of data; specifically, pertaining to credibility and claim that activities that increase the probability of high credibility, are (a) prolonged engagement (b) persistent observation and (c) triangulation of data. Prolonged engagement entails spending sufficient time in the field observing the setting, interacting with participants, and developing rapport with members of the culture. As the instructor of the course, my immersion in the research context for several hours a week during the study helped me build a mutually rewarding relationship and rapport with the participants and enabled me to rise above any preconceptions. Moreover, persistent observation as the classroom instructor provided me with an in-depth understanding of the research context and participants, thus allowing me to identify any contextual factors that were relevant to the issue being studied. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) aptly put it, “if prolonged engagement provides scope, persistent observation provides depth” (p.304).

To increase trust in the validity of the study, Triangulation was used. Triangulation is the method of corroborating evidence from not only various individuals, but also types of data and methods of collection (Creswell, 2007). In this study, as mentioned earlier, various methods of data collection were used, such as conference interviews, participant-observation, document analysis, and questionnaires to ensure triangulation of methods. Additionally, evidence for the findings was corroborated across
various data sources, such as course artifacts, participant journals, interview transcripts and field notes.

*Member checking* refers to the participant’s verification of the accuracy of the account reported and is positioned as “the most crucial technique” (p.314) by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Member checking in this study was employed by contacting participants to ask if the interpretations were fair and representative of the participants. In initial stages of data collection, participants were provided with a transcript and tentative findings to capture their perspectives and verify the accuracy of the findings. In later stages, as patterns emerged and themes developed out of the data, the participants were emailed a copy of the initial description of findings to check for accuracy. Randy and Jie were engaged in this process and often sought to clarify or explain their position. For example, in reference to Jie’s confusion about common knowledge, she sought to explain that it was a hard concept to grasp and she was unfamiliar with it because she never came across it in her academic experiences in her home country. Nonetheless, she verified that this was a challenge she faced.

*Researcher reflexivity* is necessary to reduce any biases that may affect the data analysis or interpretation (Lather, 1986). This also implies openly acknowledging dilemmas that may arise during the teaching process as well as examining my practice as a teacher and researcher. Lincoln (1995) refers to this as *critical subjectivity* and claims it is absolutely necessary for a researcher to engage in reflexivity in which the researcher examines his/her own psychological and emotional state prior to, during and after the research experience. To ensure this kind of critical subjectivity, I maintained a reflexive
journal in which I recorded all my biases, thoughts, beliefs, and assumptions during the data gathering process and data analysis process.

*Transferability* determines whether a study is transferable to another context, and that would depend on the level of thick description provided by the researcher about the participants, context, and the research process. Erickson (1986) refers to this notion as “particularizability” in which cases are documented with thick description so that the reader can determine *transferability*. Hence “the match between researcher’s categories and interpretations and what is actually true” (Lather, 1986, p.244) needs to be achieved through prolonged engagement, thick descriptions, and a clear and detailed account of the research process. In this study, a detailed description of the context in which the participants engaged in was provided in addition to the participants, data collection and analysis procedures to ensure credibility of the study.

**Summary**

To sum up, this chapter provided the methodological framework for data collection and analysis. As seen in the chapter, the study used a multiple qualitative case study approach to investigate how three multilingual novice writers navigated the academic domain of source-based writing using literary and nonliterary source texts. In keeping with the tenets of qualitative research, the participants were selected using “purposeful sampling” to provide a “reasonable coverage of the phenomenon given the purpose of the study” and to provide “information-rich cases” (Patton, 1990, p.186). Data were analyzed using an interpretive stance and an inductive approach, and the data collection and analysis were informed by scholarly literature in qualitative research.
(Creswell, 2007; Erickson, 1986; Lather, 1986; Patton, 1990) and guided by the theoretical assumptions grounded in Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of mediation as put forth by Lantolf (2000). To enhance trustworthiness of the data and credibility of the study, triangulation of data and methods were performed.
CHAPTER 4

THE CASE OF JIE

Introduction

In the current chapter and the next two chapters that follow, I present the findings for each of the study’s three participants. Each case is presented independently of the others, with cross-case analysis occurring in the final chapter, Chapter Seven, in response to the study’s research questions. The data for these chapters comes from participant journals, written artifacts such as course assignments (including feedback from the instructor), their response papers, contributions to online forums, and interviews conducted during tutorials. In these three findings chapters, I provide a detailed discussion of each participant’s academic literacy journey of learning to use source texts, with a specific focus on using a literary text as a source text. Using an ethnographic approach to textual analysis as the primary approach to data analysis, I investigated how each participant navigated the complex academic task of writing from sources and attempt to capture the complexity and multifaceted nature of their literacy journey to learn this complex academic skill.

As will be seen, each of their experiences is unique, and their approach to the academic discursive practice of integrating source texts, specifically the literary text they were assigned to read, into the composition of their own texts, varies based on their
personal experiences in reading and writing academically. For the purposes of this research, I focused on two major assignments in the course that were written in relation to the literary text: the *Mini Research Paper* and the *Long Research Paper*, assignments that occurred later in the course following completion of various tasks designed to prepare the students to write essays using sources.

This chapter, as the first of the findings chapters, begins with a closer look at the analytical approach used in the study so as to contextualize the presentation of results that follows. This is followed by a description of key information pertaining to the academic writing course that served as the study’s research site. The chapter then shifts to the first of three case studies to be presented, the case of Jie.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

As presented in Chapter 3, an ethnographic approach to textual analysis as a research method was used to provide a complete and fuller perspective on how multilingual writers navigate the complex discursive practice of source-based writing. The notion of an *ethnography of writing* was used as a framework to examine the setting in which the texts were written and the purposes for writing the texts. A textual analysis in combination with an ethnography of writing allowed for an examination of second language writing from a more situated and contextualized perspective (Swales & Leubs, 1995) and, moreover, allowed for the examination of ways in which academic writing tasks are conceptualized by students and teachers within the context of an educational setting, by taking into account not only significant texts and practices but also the perspectives of different participants (Flowerdew, 2002).
By accounting for situational contexts in which the text was produced, this qualitative approach offers a situated view of genre and goes beyond the text into the social and cultural context surrounding the genre, thus allowing for an ethnographic analysis of contexts in which the text was produced, thereby factoring in the participant’s views on text production. The participants in this study came from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and hence, taking into account the social and cultural context in which each text was constructed was considered of vital importance in this study. The use of a text-oriented ethnography which uses student interviews, description of context, and a fine-grained analysis of student’s essays/texts provides us with a theoretical frame to understand how participants compose their texts by drawing on other source texts. Adopting this approach facilitated the examination of a specific text as well as the social and cultural context in which it was produced and thus provides an emic perspective into the participant’s production of the text. Through this approach, I was able to identify and develop key themes related to each participant’s experiences with source-based writing. Those themes are the focus of each case study.

Also important is the theoretical underpinnings that guided the analysis of the study. Specifically, I used the framework of Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of mediation as extended by Lantolf (2000) to make sense of how the participants navigated and negotiated elements of source-based writing. Lantolf’s perspectives on mediation offered a lens to understand how “humans use symbolic artifacts to establish an indirect or mediated relationship between ourselves and the world” (Lantolf, 2000 p.1) and how the semiotic mechanisms such as signs and tools that are embedded in everyday practices
have the potential to mediate social activity. These semiotic tools are artifacts created by humans and include “language; various systems of counting; mnemonic techniques; algebraic symbol systems; works of art; writing; schemes; diagrams; maps; and mechanical drawings; all sorts of conventional signs and so on” (Vygotsky 1981 p.137).

**Overview of the Course**

According to the writing programs guidelines, the 108.01 course, which ran ten weeks, was designed to offer advanced multilingual international students guidance in research writing principles and appropriate use of source texts. The primary goal of the course was to teach students how to write argumentatively on a topic and provide evidentiary support for their claims, as argumentation is considered a crucial form of academic reading, writing, and thinking at the university level. The following is a more elaborate statement of the course’s aims that was distributed to students at the beginning of the course:

This course will focus on the fundamental elements of incorporating sources of knowledge into academic research papers. This will involve reading about a specific theme, reflecting on the information, and participating in knowledge building. There will be a strong focus on appropriate use and citation of sources in order to avoid plagiarism. A central goal of the course is to prepare you for writing academic papers for mainstream university courses in which you must use sources to develop and support ideas. The course will allow you to participate in a variety of activities designed to move from writing that relies on personal experience to that which combines personal knowledge with the expertise of others in order to persuade or argue a stance or point of view.
The syllabus which outlines the various sequential elements of source-based writing taught in the 108.01 is provided below in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Building blocks of Source-Based Writing Taught in the 108.01 Course

A fundamental element of the course involved citing sources correctly and constructing a research paper by integrating and synthesizing sources from various texts to support the proposition or claim stated in the paper. As seen in Figure 3, the 108.01 course
emphasized the reading/writing connection and focused on the fundamental elements of incorporating sources into a research paper. While major assignments were based on argumentation, the course covered a multi-step reading-writing process which began with exploring ideas and reading articles on general topics and followed with focusing on ideas, summarizing and responding to source texts, planning and organizing, searching for and incorporating evidence, and rhetorical and evaluative strategies. These activities served a scaffolding function as students moved toward completion of the research paper task.

Each assignment was designed to teach students the complex academic literacy skills of paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting, and citing sources appropriately. There was a strong focus on appropriate use and citation of sources in order to avoid plagiarism (108.01 syllabus). An extended definition of academic writing was included in the syllabus that explained to students what it meant to write academically. Anecdotally speaking, most students appeared to consider this as just another English language course and failed to recognize the distinct genre of ‘academic writing.’ This perception was perhaps not surprising, in that the students tended to come from countries and educational backgrounds in which writing was not taught in courses devoted strictly to writing, but rather within a broader general English framework.

**Description of course assignments**

To achieve its aims, the course included a number of written assignments in the form of six reflection/response papers, one summary paper, a mini-source paper, a long research paper, and a wiki project. A brief description of each of the assignments is given below. The next table describes the course assignments not explored in this study but that
provided an important backdrop to the two writing tasks analyzed in this and the next two chapters (and thus contributes to the qualitative approach to analysis employed in the study).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Reflection Papers</td>
<td>The students wrote a total of 6 response papers and responded to assigned pages of the literary text. Each response paper was graded with feedback and returned to students before they wrote the next response paper. The students were encouraged to incorporate feedback from the previous response paper into their next paper. Reminders were often posted on the online classroom system Carmen. For example, The feedback received on each response paper needs to be applied to future response papers and likewise future assignments. You are expected to make progress from one reflection paper to the next, both linguistically as well as analytically. Be sure to state your claim at the beginning of your reflection paper and make connections with at least one other text throughout the discussion. (Posted on Carmen: April 27, 2010). The purpose of this assignment was to ensure that students read and understood the literary text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Summary Paper</td>
<td>For this assignment, students wrote a one-page summary of the book chapter “The Transcendence Zone” written by Maria Coffey and taken from the book Where the Mountain casts its shadow. The purpose of this assignment was to give students an opportunity to practice their summarizing skills which are important tools in writing a research paper.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued Table 5: Description of Course Assignments
The Reflection papers were written in response to the literary text *Into the Wild*. The novel *Into the Wild* by Jon Krakauer is nonfiction account based on a true life story of a young man named Christopher McCandless. Having been raised in a privileged family, McCandless denounced his lifestyle and sought freedom in the American wilderness. He takes off on a journey seeking solace and adventure and four months later, his decomposed body is found by a Moose hunter. The book documents McCandless’s journey into the wilderness and captures his powerful encounters with people along the way, who in the end, help to piece together the mystery of how McCandless came to die. Krakauer reconstructs the mysterious circumstances surrounding the death of McCandless by assembling facts of the young man’s life and presenting evidence to show what led to his tragic end.

The reflection papers emphasized a claim / evidence pattern of writing which encouraged them to synthesize evidence from the text and incorporate it into their response. Gradually, students were encouraged to use other sources in the course to support their claims made in the response paper. Students received feedback and
guidance on their response papers each week. All these three assignments described in Table 5 were meant to scaffold skills such as paraphrasing, quoting, integration of evidence, summarizing and citing sources, which students would later use in their Mini and Long Research Paper. The second table below (Table 6) describes the mini-research and long research papers that are the focus of this study.

Table 6: Description of Course Assignments that Form the Focus of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Directions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Mini Research Paper  | This assignment required students to construct their own research question on a topic of their choice that was related to the course theme and to develop an argument and support it with any two sources that were used in the course and two additional external sources. Prior to writing, they submitted an outline. The word limit for this assignment was 800 words and the guidelines for this assignment along with a rubric were posted on carmen.  
**The main purpose** of this assignment was to immerse students in the practice of a specific genre independently before attempting the final task of the long research paper. |
| The Long Research Paper  | This assignment required students to demonstrate everything they had learned throughout the quarter specifically, in terms of using sources, organizing their ideas, paraphrasing and summarizing information and citing sources appropriately. Students were allowed to select a topic of their choice that was related to the course theme and they had to use at least 4-5 sources with the literary text as a mandatory source text. They had to submit an outline first with a thesis and plan for their paper. How they used and cited sources was also of primary importance in assignment. The guidelines for this assignment and a rubric were posted on carmen.  
**The goal** was to teach students source integration and appropriate citation. |

For the Mini Research Paper, students were expected to display their skills of paraphrasing, summarizing and quoting wherever necessary. They were encouraged to paraphrase and demonstrate their understanding of the source text content they borrowed from. The students had written up to four response papers prior to the Mini Research
Paper, which were meant to scaffold their performance on the Mini Research Paper.

Similarly, for the Long Research Paper, students were expected to demonstrate all the skills taught throughout the course, including paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting, citing appropriately, linking ideas throughout their argument, connecting the evidence to their claims, synthesizing information from various sources, and arguing their claims with evidentiary support.

In what follows, I provide a detailed description of how Jie navigated the academic discursive practice of writing from sources, both literary and nonliterary, revealing where she struggled and where she succeeded in her attempts to gain command of this practice. This is done by examining a number of themes and issues which arose in the qualitative analysis of her participation in the writing activities of the 108.01 course.

The Case of Jie

Background Information about Jie

Jie came from mainland China and had been in the US for three months prior to the study. Since she was a child, she was passionate about Archaeology and read up a lot on this topic in Chinese. Her plan was to major in Archaeology in China, but she ended up failing the university entrance exams in China and, as a result, entered a lesser university that she did not approve of. Upon the insistence of her mother, she changed her academic major and moved to the United States to pursue a degree in Communications. Jie’s dream was to work as a photography editor for the National Geographic magazine in China. She described herself as shy and nervous when she talked with Americans, though this varied with the circumstance at hand. For instance, when she was in China,
she would talk to American and Canadian tourists without any difficulty in communicating, but when she came to the US, she felt slightly intimidated in her interactions with local Americans. She believed that the major cultural differences between the two countries made it difficult for her to communicate in English. However, Jie’s oral proficiency in English was good enough to carry on a conversation with no trouble. She was enthusiastic about participating in this study and, in an email, thanked me for the opportunity to participate, as she believed it would help her improve her English communication skills and would enable her to gain experience communicating with a native speaker of English.

As a novice writer with regard to English, Jie’s academic writing experience in English was limited, and this was her first writing course at the university; thus, she was determined to improve her English writing skills. Her journal entries provided some interesting reflections on what she was experiencing as a freshman. She enjoyed writing in the reflective journal and often rambled off on various tangents while writing her honest thoughts as if it were her personal diary, but with the instructor as the audience. Her writing style tended to be colloquial, and she seemed quite self-critical about her writing skills. For example, in one of her journal entries, she stated, “I found that I used a lot of simple sentences in my paper. I tried to use some complex sentences and words, but it didn’t work. Do you think my journals and reflection papers are qualified?” (Journal #3, April 23, 2010). In another entry, she apologized for writing the reflection paper at the last minute in a hurry and stated “I know the reflection paper I wrote was terrible. I should have done it earlier.” (Journal #2, April 19, 2010).
Jie’s reflection papers adopted a colloquial tone and, initially, were mostly summary-oriented rather than responses. Eventually, in the course, with regular feedback after writing about three response papers, she grasped the idea of focusing more on the response than the summary. As a novice academic writer, she used various strategies to cope with the difficulty of writing in English. In one instance, for one of her research papers, Jie selected a topic that was related to her home culture, that is, she chose to discuss the perception of heroes across different cultures, specifically selecting Chinese and American perspectives. As an insider to her Chinese culture, Jie relied on her special status and thus had access to knowledge and experiences that gave her the added advantage of being an expert on the topic of Chinese perspectives. In other words, she was tapping into a schema she already possessed and valued. Thus, with the help of culturally constructed auxiliary means (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.59), Jie used a cultural artifact such as her personal identity to mediate the academic literacy practice she engaged in order to navigate her assignment.

Interestingly, a similar strategy was used by a Chinese student in Leki’s (1995) study, “Coping strategies of ESL writers”, in which Ling, an international student from Taiwan, relied heavily on her home culture as a strategy to cope with her university assignments. She did so by incorporating some aspect of the Taiwanese culture into every assignment. Leki points out that, “as a Taiwanese, she had access to an entire body of knowledge and experience that her classmates and even her professors lacked and that helped to compensate for other linguistic and educational disadvantages” (p.248). On the whole, although Jie was struggling with writing in English, she made a concerted effort to
minimize her struggle by adopting a positive attitude in the learning process and using
cultural resources available in her social context to navigate discursive practices at the
academy.

**Academic Literacy Experiences**

Jie enjoyed reading literary texts in her native language, Chinese, and had read
about four literary texts in English. She enjoyed reading fictional and historical literary
texts and had a positive attitude towards reading. She believed that reading was the best
way to improve her vocabulary, writing and speaking skills. However, she did not
particularly enjoy reading literature/literary texts in English, as she found the vocabulary
to be quite challenging; it often interrupted her reading. Still, she had a positive attitude
towards learning and believed that reading was the best way to improve her English. She
was excited to read the literary text *Into the Wild* assigned in the course, stating: “I can
learn writing, vocabulary and even some speaking from it” (Interview- April 13, 2010).

Jie had a vague idea of academic writing in English and stated that she had never
written academically before. In her interview with me, she described it as including a
formality of register and vocabulary, but in her journal, she seemed have a more scientific
view of it. She wrote:

As for me, academic writing is kind of a record which is written down for
the experimental, educational or predicted conclusion in a certain domain.
I am not sure whether the essays we write and hand in as homework can
be regarded as academic writing. I think the definition of real academic
writing is more professional than the homework or some research reports.

(Journal #1, April 11, 2010)
Interestingly, in her opinion, writing response papers to a reading did not count as academic writing. As for her writing experiences, she wrote a lot in English in her high school and criticized the kind of writing she did in China as “having no rules.” She stated,

When I was in China we did a lot of papers for various courses. Actually these papers can be called plagiarism in American way because the rules in China are very loose, no teachers will check where you got the source. So writing is really an easy job.

(Journal #1, April 11, 2010)

Jie was excited to experience a different educational system and was looking forward to new academic experiences as a student at an American university. She often compared American university rules and culture to her educational experiences in China, including citation practices. While discussing source texts in an interview with me, she mentioned:

J: In the universities in China, students don’t care about this. We just borrow book from library and copy or paste something from it and hand it in. Sometimes we cite the source but sometimes we don’t.

(Interview - April 13, 2010)

She indicated that writing English papers in her university in China was rigid and controlled, as the topics were always assigned to her by her professors and, as a result, she had trouble choosing her topic for her research papers in the 108.01 course. She seemed disappointed by the lack of freedom to choose topics in her home country and was often critical of the academic environment she had studied in. Nonetheless, Jie was self-motivated and held a positive attitude towards learning and towards her life in a new country and culture. She made every effort to immerse herself in her new environment and engaged in community group work on campus, worked part-time, and was a full time
international student. However, as the academic term progressed, Jie began to feel slightly overwhelmed by university life. She wrote in her journal:

I have to admit that I have not got started to write my mini-research paper. I don’t want to find any excuses but I have to say that I really feel exhausted this quarter. The part time job, the midterms and even the homework, all of these just drive me crazy. It is quite hard to manage the time reasonably.

(Journal # 4, May 1, 2010)

She had a hectic schedule and complained that procrastination was responsible for her inefficient use of time. While studying, she often distracted herself by logging on to a Chinese social website called Renren—the Chinese version of Facebook—as she increasingly found life in America to be boring for an international student like herself. This busy lifestyle may have impacted her approach to writing in the 108.01 course.

**Reading Experiences Related to Source-based Writing**

How Jie read the assigned material had an impact on how she wrote about it. For instance, while reading the literary text *Into the Wild*, Jie would often connect the events in the main character’s life with her personal experiences and, in doing so, analyzed the literary text in greater depth. She wrote: “when I connect his life with myself, I feel much comfortable. I cannot explain it, maybe Chris did the things I dreamt to do but had no courage. He devoted his priceless life.” (Journal # 5, May 15, 2010). Jie’s connection of the text to her personal experiences may have helped her make sense of the text (Carrell, 1987) and, ideally, prepare herself to write about it more effectively. By connecting events in the text with her personal experiences, Jie relied on her cultural experiences to mediate and navigate her academic experience. This in a way seemed to facilitate her
reading and helped her overcome her linguistic difficulties, thus enabling her to creatively engage in the reading process, and, in the framework of reading-writing connections noted at the beginning of the chapter, paved the way to write about her reading.

While reading the assigned literary text, Jie created a word-list of unfamiliar words that she sought to acquire and use in her writing. Her strategy was to read each book or article several times and consult the dictionary for words that were unfamiliar to her. This process of recording and learning vocabulary while reading slowed her down considerably in terms of completing her assignments; nonetheless, she made a conscious effort to integrate these new words into her writing (Journal #2, April 19, 2010). She was determined to increase her vocabulary rapidly. Learning new words was exciting for Jie, and she was eager to incorporate these new words into her writing. In her journal, she noted:

I did notice that the author had used many adjective to depict a scene of a overjoyed drifter with both free-spirit and free-body. Also, Chris himself would like to use this kind of word to describe his fierce emotion, and through these words, like” jubilant”, “overjoyed” and “hope bursts”, the readers could get the information that he was very satisfied and excited about the wild journey he was taking at that time.

(Journal # 2, April 19, 2010)

What this reflects is that Jie used the strategy of “writerly reading” (Hirvela, 2004) while reading the literary text. “Writerly reading” is a way of using reading to learn about writing, whether it is syntax, lexis, organizational features, etc. and is done with a view to improve one’s writing. Such reading can also help writers identify material in the source texts to be incorporated into their own writing. Jie’s goal in this context was to gather
new vocabulary for the purpose of improving her linguistic abilities. Thus, she read, gathered vocabulary, and sought to use the new words in her writing. In other words, the purpose for reading determined what strategies she used.

However, Jie often struggled with lexical issues while reading. Although she was excited to learn new vocabulary, she spent a lot of time reading and trying to decipher the meaning of new words. Like many second language writers, her biggest obstacle while reading was encountering vocabulary that was unfamiliar. In her first journal entry, she wrote:

Honestly, I finished reading on Wednesday night. I took about hours to read the book. The vocabulary is a big challenge. I didn’t want to be disturbed by the strange words, they are in a very big amount. I just skipped them and tried to understand the point of every sentence without figured out what was the meaning of these annoying words. After I finishing the first time of reading, I read the assigned pages again. But this time I looking up every word I didn't know in the dictionary. I got stuck sometimes, so I think I will take some time to read the third time tonight.

(Journal #1, April 11, 2010)

Clearly, unfamiliar vocabulary interrupted Jie’s flow of reading and left her frustrated. Potentially, this could also have impacted on her writing. Also, evident from the quote above is the obstacles Jie encountered while reading texts with unfamiliar vocabulary. Her initial reaction to making a word list was that it was enjoyable and exciting; gradually, though, the volume of unfamiliar words during the reading process began to add to her frustration. Jie patiently read the weekly assigned pages more than once at a time, which was time consuming and a possible negative influence on her later reading activity in the course.
Jie was eager to read the literary text *Into the Wild* and was deeply moved by the story of Christopher McCandless. She was motivated to read about his adventures and to learn about what led to his death. In her journal, she wrote:

> I have a affinity of Chris and his expedition indeed. The more I read, the more curious I felt. Digging more is not only because it is necessary for supporting my view, but also I like the guy who was treated as an eccentric for his rebel behavior.

*(Journal # 5, May 13, 2010)*

Jie was so passionate about the story of Christopher McCandless that she chose to write her Mini Research Paper on a topic pertaining to the literary text—“how literature impacts the minds of young readers.” She was curious to find out if McCandless was influenced by some of the works he read, such as by Tolstoy and Jack London, and wanted to research the issue of whether there were other examples of literature impacting young readers in a way that would inspire them to change their life. In her journal, she wrote:

> I am curious about it, especially about why Chris would pursue a life style which was very close to vagrancy, and was there any association with these books... I will figure out that whether the example of Chris is a extreme one, further, I also want to get to know some other examples about this.

*(Journal # 3, April 20, 2010)*

As an avid reader of the literary text, Jie appreciated the author’s rhetorical style and praised the book at every opportunity. The literary text left a deep impression on her, and she was surprised to learn about the events that led to McCandless’s death as the story unfolded. As such, when she read, she immersed herself into the character of McCandless in order to understand what he was going through. She presented an in-depth analysis of
his character in her response papers, and she often made connections between his experiences and dreams and her personal life. For example, in one of her response papers, she stated:

Actually I also have this kind of fantasy. The difference is he just realized his fantasy. I call this a fantasy rather than dream because it is really beyond our real life. It is so extreme and crazy to abandon all his possession and even his family (However I found that he seemed to have some problems in communicating with his families, and they had divergence in many aspects of his life. But as for me, it was not a reasonable excuse for him to live a wild life in a kind of abstinence and self-imposed.

(Response #1 - 4/11/2010)

Jie’s in-depth analysis of the text represented the scaffolding (Wood et al. 1976) effect that the activity of writing response papers intended. The purpose of writing response papers was to allow students to develop their analytical skills in preparation for source-based writing. Jie often related her personal experiences to those of McCandless and expressed admiration for his courage. As she got deeper into the literary text, she became completely absorbed into the story of Christopher McCandless. Throughout the process of writing response papers, Jie consistently presented her interpretation of the story as it unfolded to her as a reader and skillfully analyzed the events that took place. This analysis would later assist her source-based writing, specifically the integration of evidentiary support to warrant her claims. Another example of her analysis is presented below:

The affinity of Alex was increasing with the processing of reading. I like this guy more and more. Not merely because of his intelligence, courage to break the line and even the fallacious dream. These are distinct trait Alex had, but also because of his timidity of human intimacy. It is quite a special and necessary personality of him. With the timidity, Alex
would become very prudence of keeping a relationship with the people who appeared in his life. He could abandon his family, keep the person who cared about him with a great concern “at arm’s length”. Free from all emotional burdens which could be the obstacles on his way to find the truth of his life. Even though, his letter to Ron was sincere. I have to admit that after reading the letter he wrote to Ron I could understand him much better.

(Response paper # 3 - 4/24/2010)

From the excerpt above, we can see that as Jie began uncovering details about Alex in the literary text, she found herself enjoying the literary text even more. She interpreted his journey into the Alaskan wilderness as a “fallacious dream” and analyzed him to be intimidated by human intimacy. For a novice academic writer, she connected with the text at a deep level and presented her interpretation in a context that was meaningful for her. These connections with the text and interpretations of the events in the text scaffolded her learning process and paved the way for her source-based writing assignments, in which she used the literary text Into the Wild as a source text.

As will be seen in the following section, Jie did face a few challenges while navigating the genre of source-based writing that were mainly discursive components of the nature of source-based writing and were connected to the process of researching, ineffective source use, and organizational issues. While Jie encountered a number of challenges in source-based writing, there were also successes in what she did across both the Mini and Long Research Paper. As will be seen in the later section, in the Mini (MRP) and Long Research Paper (LRP), Jie skillfully integrated both the literary text Into the Wild and non-literary texts as source texts to support her claims. In the MRP, Jie summarized, paraphrased and extracted source material efficiently to support her
argument that literature may impact young minds; there was evidence of good summarizing skills and effective use of evidence to support her claims. As will be seen, the MRP seemed to scaffold Jie’s learning of a new genre and provided her with the experience of writing a research paper. Hence, in the LRP that followed, she seemed to have no apparent trouble using both the literary text and non-literary texts as source texts and wove in evidence skillfully; in fact, there was evidence of a more systematic and argumentative style. In both the MRP and LRP, Jie met requirements and received an A-in each respective assignment, suggesting that there was room for improvement in her writing.

Challenges in Source-based Writing

While Jie had no trouble weaving in evidence from both literary and non-literary texts to support her argument, she did face a few challenges while writing the MRP and LRP. In both her MRP and LRP, Jie struggled with discursive elements of research-based writing, such as the process of researching, ineffective source use, and organizational issues. In the following section, I will discuss the above mentioned challenges that Jie faced with the practice of source-based writing. These challenges are discussed in more detail in the next few subsections. The purpose of this section is to highlight the complexities involved in learning the multifaceted genre of source-based writing.

“Finding a source is not an easy job” - Struggle with researching
The Mini Research Paper required students to use two sources from the course and two external sources which students had to locate independently. The purpose of including two external sources was to give students an opportunity to research and
evaluate sources independently. This also allowed them the opportunity to experience multimodal composing instead of the traditional reliance on print-based sources. Students were first informed about the MRP assignment in week 1 of the course when the syllabus and various assignments were discussed. The guidelines for all of the assignments, including the MRP, were posted on the course website. The outline for the MRP was due in week 5, and the paper was due at the end of week 6 of the course.

Although Jie was excited to write about her topic for her Mini Research Paper, she procrastinated and waited until the last minute to write her paper. As for finding sources for her MRP, Jie found it to be the most challenging part of completing this assignment. Jie’s paper examined “the impact of adventure-based literature on young minds,” and she used three sources, one print-based and two screen-based, to support her argument. See Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Name of source text</th>
<th>Type of source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Once Upon a Time- Together: An Intergenerational Reading Program Empowering TEENAGE Parents to Develop the Emerging Literacy of Their Children While Reducing their Own Literacy Deficiencies</em> by J.B Hoffman (1992).</td>
<td>E-book - Non-literary text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jie’s paper depended heavily on one source—the literary text *Into the Wild*, from which her topic was extracted—and included two external sources: an electronic book
source, *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* by Jules Verne (2006, and an electronic Amazon book source *Once Upon a Time- Together: An Intergenerational Reading Program Empowering TEENAGE Parents to Develop the Emerging Literacy of Their Children While Reducing their Own Literacy Deficiencies* by J.B Hoffman (1992). The former source by Verne was mentioned and described in the book *Into the Wild*, and Jie consulted it as a source text to learn more about the story of the main character in the book - Captain Nemo. Since the book did not provide detailed information about the story of Captain Nemo, Jie went to Google and used an electronic source to learn more about the story. The second external source, by Hoffman, was a source she consulted to learn more about young adult vulnerability to information in books. Once again, she relied on internet source using Google as her primary search engine. From a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978), Jie seemed to rely on cultural tools such as the internet to navigate the MRP. In her quest to locate these external sources, Jie noted her struggles with finding sources to support her argument:

Finding a source is not an easy job. All the materials I knew well so far are seldom, and most of them came from the literary text *Into the Wild*. I am sure I will use Christopher McCandless as the main source of the mini research paper.

(Journal # 4 May 1, 2010)

While researching the MRP, she struggled with identifying the relevance of the other sources to her research topic. She complained that “the articles only focused on risk-taking and adventure stated nothing about young minds and literature.” (Interview- April 30, 2010). In her journal she mentioned:
I read the literary text very carefully and also the articles I got in the class. But I did not find any related materials of my topic, even there were something in deep which needed to dig. And I did not use the external materials either, because I started it too late to find enough external evidence to support my view. However, the literary text was the most useful source during the processing of organizing and writing. Actually, I figured out the topic from the literary text itself.

(Journal #5 May 13, 2010)

Clearly, as a novice writer new to the genre of research-based writing, Jie struggled with finding appropriate source texts. Locating sources is an important element of writing a research paper, and students attended a library session to learn this process. However, locating sources can be time-consuming and requires advance planning on the part of the writer, and moreover, determining the relevance and suitability of the source to the research paper is an additional struggle novice writers like Jie have to cope with. Jie’s struggle with this element highlights the complexity of the source-based writing. As can be seen in her statements above, Jie started looking for sources late in the process of writing her MRP and as a result did not have enough time to conduct her research adequately. Jie realized her mistake and regretted her inefficient planning; she remarked in her journal how she would do things differently for the Long Research Paper: She wrote, “when it comes to what have I learned from the mini research paper, the first and the most important thing is that I really should not do it at the last minute and prepare the materials as much as I can” (Journal # 5 May 15, 2013). This quotation shows that Jie had a learning experience with regarding to writing a research paper and realized that a complex academic task such as writing from sources requires strategic planning and research well in advance.
The Long Research Paper (LRP) required students to use at least four to five resources. Jie used five different sources in her paper, and these represented a significantly multimodal approach to the assignment. See Table 8 below:

Table 8: Name and Type of Source Texts used in the LRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Name of source text</th>
<th>Type of source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A First Look at Communication Theory</em> by Em Griffin</td>
<td>E-book – Non-literary text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Transcendence Zone by Maria Coffey</td>
<td>Book chapter- Literary text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>I am a Legend</em> directed by F. Lawrence</td>
<td>Movie- Media source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hero</em> directed by Yimou Zhang.</td>
<td>Movie- Media source</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Jie received guidance in locating sources that were relevant to her argument in the library session that was part of the course, she spent considerable time reading her sources, and looking for evidence to support her claims; she struggled with locating specific information in other sources to support her argument. This challenge could relate back to Jie’s afore-mentioned struggle with reading and in fact highlights the interdependent relationship between reading and writing processes (Spack, 1988). It also suggests that transfer from being taught how to do something and actually doing it is a complex process with respect to academic literacy. Students were not only taught how to locate print and electronic sources and determine their credibility, but they were also instructed on how to select and integrate evidence for their argument. In-class exercises were done in regard to evidence integration to allow students to apply their newly learned knowledge. Despite this instruction, it seems like as a novice academic student, Jie
struggled with interpretation and extraction of ideas from source texts to include in the composition of her Long Research Paper. Spack (1988) highlights the complexity of reading in a second language and reminds us that understanding an author’s purpose in a text and understanding the text accurately is not easy for second language readers. In both the MRP and the LRP, as a novice academic writer, despite receiving instruction on locating sources and selecting evidence from source texts, Jie seemed to struggle with identifying the suitability and relevance of sources to her argument and, therefore, experienced a struggle in the process of source-text location and use which can be attributable to the lack of reading experience in English and navigation of a new genre of writing.

“Just because it is a general claim, I didn’t cite” - Ineffective source use
Another discursive aspect of source-based writing that Jie struggled with was using sources effectively. As a novice academic writer navigating an unknown genre of academic writing, she encountered some difficulties in using source materials. A crucial problem in Jie’s MRP was related to an inappropriate use of source material. While Jie consistently and correctly cited the literary text Into the Wild as one of her sources that she borrowed from, she failed to correctly cite a nonliterary source that she had used, as pointed out earlier. As will be seen in her MRP, Jie included the source at the end of her paper in the reference list, but did not cite it in the body of the text even though she actually drew information from the source. Hence, it was unclear what she borrowed from that source, or even if she did. In the section below is a transcript of Jie’s (J) explanation in the one-to-one conference with the instructor (I) for why she didn’t provide in-text citations for this source:
From the interaction above, we can infer that Jie was confused about what to cite within the body of the text, a very specific convention of academic writing. The practice of citing common knowledge was addressed in the course, but given the contextual and situational variance of what constitutes common knowledge (Chandrasoma et al., 2004; Pennycook, 1996), the topic could have been blurry. Since Jie read the online source text and paraphrased information from it, she believed that citing the source was unnecessary. Moreover, she felt like the information was a commonly known fact and assumed that citation of the source was not needed. Jie’s uncertainty may point to the blurry concept of what constitutes common knowledge (McCulloch, 2012; Thompson, 2005), especially across cultures. Jie’s experience with inappropriate citation is echoed in several second language studies. For instance, Shi (2004) studied textual borrowing in the writing of native English speakers and Chinese students using English as an L2. In her analysis, she found that while native English speakers relied more on direct quotations than L2 writers, L2 writers tended to use larger amounts of texts without acknowledging sources. She pointed out that, for Chinese students, this was a result of what they had learned within
their own culture and rhetoric, where students are taught that what is commonly known need not be cited.

Jie was presumably influenced by this Chinese understanding of citation practices and what constitutes common knowledge. Shi concluded her study by emphasizing the need to differentiate between “legitimate appropriation of language from dishonest copying” (p.191) in order to help novice academic writers become members of their chosen discourse community. In her mind, Jie was appropriating common knowledge in an acceptable manner, a culturally-based understanding that may be common among second language writers. However, Jie also displayed impatience with Western-based citation practices. For example, in her journal, after writing the Long Research Paper, she stated “from writing research paper, I learned that the APA style is really tedious. I know it is the mandatory for every paper of our class, but spending half hour to finish the reference list annoyed me a lot indeed” (Journal # 7, June 5, 2010). As an undergraduate novice academic writer, Jie may have lacked sufficient knowledge of textual borrowing strategies (Campbell, 1990) and as Pennycook (1996) found in his study of Chinese students, many had a different notion of plagiarism compared to the western conceptualization of plagiarism and specifically, did not think of unattributed borrowing from source texts as plagiarism.

This confusion or blurriness about what constitutes common knowledge and appropriate citation was found in several other second language studies (Chandrasoma et al., 2004; McCulloch, 2012; Shi, 2004; Thompson, 2005), and Jie’s experience with lack of source attribution is not unique. In their article “Beyond Plagiarism: Transgressive and
non-transgressive intertextuality,” Chandrasoma et al., (2004) discuss the controversies surrounding the notion of common knowledge and the local situatedness of the concept; they argue how the concept of common knowledge can be demographically limited to a specific group of people. Their case study of Catherine, whose essays demonstrated her unique construction of common knowledge and highlighted the complexity of the issue, led them to conclude that “common knowledge within academic contexts can be an intangible domain where individual perceptions and assumptions have to be taken into consideration” (p.184). As a novice to the practice of citing sources, her lack of attribution can be seen as a developmental stage (Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2010) that novice writers go through while attempting to learn academic discursive practices.

“As for me, it is weird to writing a paper in a certain formation” - Organizational challenges

A third struggle Jie faced in writing both her research papers had to do with resisting the organizational structure of her paper. As for the Mini Research Paper, due to not having received instruction on organization and as a novice academic writer, Jie’s Mini Research Paper lacked such common components as a topic sentences and an overall structure. The paragraphs did not seem to flow logically from one point to another. An example from her mini-research paper illustrates this:

According to Krakauer(2007), “Long captivated by the writing of Leo Tolstoy, McCandless particularly admired how the great literary textist had forsaken a life of wealth and privilege to wander among the destitute. In college McCandless began emulating Tolstoy’s asceticism and moral rigor to a degree that first astonished,” “When the boy headed off into the Alaska bush, he entertained no illusions that he was trekking into a land of milk and honey; peril, adversity, and Tolstoy a renunciation were precisely what he was seeking. And that is what he found,
in abundance.” (p.2). It is apparent that Chris was deeply impacted by the books written by Leo Tolstoy. He admired and embodied the spirit of asceticism and rigor. But only this could be treated as the reason of his rigor. As the author reported what Westerberg said in Chapter 2(Krakauer, 2007), “He read a lot. Used a lot of big words. I think maybe part of what got him into trouble was that he did too much thinking.” (p. 18). Taking Chris as an example, he was born in an affluent family, but from the literary text, the family was also stereotyped. Cultivated by the radical literary text he read, he found that he was hardly to bear the stiff restriction of his family and even the society. Ironically, Chris himself was so stubborn a person that once he made up his mind to chase the ultimate truth of life, he would never quit.

(MRP- May 10, 2013)

A teacher comment Jie received on her Mini Research Paper was “the Mini Research Paper lacked overall structure and organization that might have helped make your argument stronger” (MRP Feedback- May 13, 2010). Although the instructional component of organization and structure was not yet delivered to the students, the students were provided with an outline that operated as a template which provided a suggested organizational plan for the paper. For example, the template included components such as thesis statement; topic sentence 1, 2 and 3; and a concluding paragraph. (Please see Appendix G for the sample outline provided to students). The outline was meant to scaffold (Wood et. al., 1976) the navigation of the MRP by breaking down complex elements (such as organization) of the task.

Additionally, between writing the Mini Research Paper (week 6) and prior to the writing the Long Research Paper (week 10), students received instruction on organizational aspects of writing a research paper and were specifically taught the importance of having a thesis statement, writing clear topic sentences, using linking
sentences to connect back to the thesis and topic sentence, and integrating evidence efficiently. This material was spread out over the last four weeks of the course. In addition, in-class exercises were also completed from the textbook to give students adequate practice of instructional content. The purpose of the MRP was to give students an opportunity to construct a brief argument from sources and become immersed in a new genre (Zamel, 1998). However, due to time restrictions resulting from this being a ten week course, it was impossible to complete all elements of instruction in source-based writing prior to the MRP. Jie admitted to writing the MRP in a rush, which left her with little time to consider the organization of ideas in the paper.

As a novice academic writer at the university, Jie still seemed to struggle with organizing the structure of the Long Research Paper despite learning about the structure and organization of ideas in the course lectures prior to starting that assignment. For example, in her journal, she stated, “I think the most difficult part for this time was organization.” (Journal #7, June 5, 2010). Jie received feedback on her first draft of the Long Research Paper that helped her identify how to improve the structure of her paper. Comments such as “need to re-organize the paper to discuss the two main notions early in the paper and lay the foundation for the reader,” and “have clear topic sentences for clarity purposes,” were provided in her first draft. However, Jie seemed to resist the formulaic structure of writing taught, and in her journal she complained about the rigid structure of writing a research paper:

As for me it is weird to writing a paper in a certain formation, I mean I had to make every paragraph in the same pattern- topic sentence, support evidence, topic sentence and support evidence. It seems like that I prefer and always do a paper in freestyle, even though it might be a bad habit. I
know the Long Research Paper is a serious academic report, but it also could be a little bit more flexible.

(Journal #7, June 5, 2010)

From this entry, Jie’s preference for a free style of writing and flexibility in the organization of ideas was evident. As a novice writer in English, Jie found the transition to writing in the Western rhetorical style slightly challenging and rigid and found the style of writing in a consistent pattern using topic sentences and explaining evidence to be inflexible. She commented on this in her journal:

No one can deny that the fixed formation make the whole paper appear to be well--organized and easy to read, but it also make the paper to be kind of stiff. I think I have cut my paper into several parts, but I do not really like to extend and strengthen my every point view in a same form. I am just stating my thought that if I wrote a paragraph with a example at first and a summary at last rather than writing a topic sentence from the first word and offer a example to support my view, it also can be understood and it will increase the fun of reading.

(Journal #7, June 5, 2010)

Based on her above entry, and as a novice writer, Jie found it challenging to adopt a writing structure different than she was used to, and it could be said that her choice of structure and organization in her paper demonstrates her exerting her agency as a writer.

While Jie encountered a number of challenges in research-based writing, there were also successes in what she did across the two research papers. The following section focuses on these successes by looking at her performance on integrating literary and non-literary source texts into the composition of her paper.
Performance while Integrating the Literary Text as a Source Text

Jie had written four response papers prior to writing the Mini Research Paper (MRP). For the response papers, students were instructed on how to support a claim with evidence and follow it with a discussion/explanation. The response papers were intended to provide the necessary scaffolding for students in preparation for the MRP. Scaffolding can be seen as one form of mediational means. As discussed in chapter 2, cultural and material artifacts tend to mediate higher forms of human mental activity and these cultural artifacts such as books, technology, paper etc. and cultural concepts such as self, person, literacy, mind etc. interact in complex dynamic ways with each other and with psychological phenomena” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.59) to give rise to higher mental functions (memory, learning and development) which allows individuals to voluntarily and intentionally gain control.

As will be seen in the section below, as a novice academic writer, Jie summarized, paraphrased and extracted source material effectively from the literary text to support her argument in both the MR paper and the LRP.

Jie’s MRP topic, “How literature impacts young minds,” argued that literature does have the power to influence young mind and was inspired by the book Into the Wild. Jie’s in-depth analysis of the literary text during her reading process scaffolded the task of source-based writing by facilitating her interpretation of the text and the integration of evidence into the composition of her own text. Jie’s MRP met the assignment’s requirements and received a grade of A-. Some instructor comments were: “Your paper was not only interesting to read, but it also demonstrated complexity of written and
analytical skills. A strong point of your paper was the fact that evidence was well-integrated and explained and a good analysis of the text was presented” (MRP Feedback- May 13, 2010).

Jie began her paper by summarizing the literary text (based on the few chapters that were read in the course) with the intent of providing readers with contextual information about the main character. She skillfully introduced the main character, Chris McCandless, along with some background on his life and education. The summary flowed well and included sufficient context for the reader to understand the main idea of the book and gain a sense of the main character’s personality. An excerpt from her MRP is below:

Christopher McCandless was born into an affluent family in the suburb of Washington, D.C.. He graduated from Emory University with A grade in every course. There is no doubt that Chris was a very intelligent student. The characteristic also indicated in the later chapters. After his graduation, Chris made a decision to carry an expedition towards Alaska, which was regarded as the wildest place of the country, and also would be attractive for the kind of tramps who were dreaming of living a free and non-restricted life like Chris. The expedition was not easy but quite simple. There was no sponsor, no supply and even no companions. It was a solitary and difficult trip. He abandoned his family and all of his possessions in order to purify the process and tried his best to avoid relying on the society. However, Chris realized his dream to live a wild life, to some extent, even he was also killed by the wildness eventually. Chris was found in a derelict bus in Alaska, dead from starvation. The information provided readers with a brief view of Christopher McCandless’s life story and the analysis of the topic will due to this information.

As can be seen in the above example, Jie seemed to display fluency in the skill of summarizing information from the literary text. For a novice academic writer, Jie’s summary met most of the objectives of summary writing in the course, which were the
following: It addressed the author’s central theme, cited the source appropriately, discussed supporting details, and extracted information that was relevant to her writing context. What is interesting here in the summary is the fact that as a novice academic writer, Jie displayed a good sense of audience awareness, which some scholars consider central to the process of writing of composing (Elbow, 1981; Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1985), in choosing to write a summary of the story in her MRP in order to provide readers with contextual information about the main character. In this regard, she was able to effectively draw on skills she had practiced earlier in the course via other written assignments, such as the response papers.

Not only did she paraphrase and summarize the source content effectively to provide background information to her reader, but Jie also integrated evidence from the literary text into her paper effectively. As mentioned earlier, the structure of claim-evidence-discussion used in the response papers was used to gauge effectiveness of source integration in the MRP. An example of this from her MRP is below:

When it comes to imitation, Everett Ruess can be another great example to representative this. Jon Krakauer stated that, Everett was inspired by the book *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* written by Jules Verne, he called himself Nemo. He showed his fascination to Captain Nemo, the main character of the book by signing his name as NEMO in Davis Gulch and admiring the story of Captain Nemo (Krakauer 2007). Given the Captain Nemo, he used be the prince of India. He abandoned his possession and concealed his identity because of the hunting the enemy of his motherland. He was exhausted about the conflicts between human beings and was also hostile to all the unfairness of the world. A despaired prince finally constructed his own kingdom by hiding into the depth of sea and fleeing from the civilized world forever. This is not a radical story, but it is quite idealistic. No one can deny that it can push the frustrated young adults to dream of a new world that may never exist. No matter
why he is frustrated, the ideal world seems to show a piece of peace. Overall, it is very evident that the literary works have enormous impact on young adults for many reasons. For the sake of the immature minds, young adults are easily to effected by various subjects of books. And in extreme example it can be harmful, but for most ordinary young adults, it just an outlet.

In the paragraph above, Jie states her claim immediately followed by evidence. As can be seen, she uses the example of Everett Ruess to explain how he was inspired by what he read. What Jie did well was provide an ensuing discussion that clearly informs the reader who Everett Ruess was and what inspired him. Her discussion of the evidence to support her claim is an example of what she practiced while writing the response papers. Moreover, her concluding point ties her evidence back to the claim thus making her argument cohesive. Jie seemed to have gained a sense of audience awareness from writing the response paper; hence, it can be inferred that the practice of writing response papers may have mediated and paved the way for her writing of the MRP. See Figure 4.
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According to the theory of mediation, semiotic means may be appropriated from the classroom (Wertsch, 1991) in the form of classroom discourse, technology, printed materials and other material artifacts which serve to mediate the transformation of basic mental functions into higher mental functions (Vygotsky, 1978) and this transfer from the social to the cognitive plane takes place within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Jie had written four response papers prior to writing the MRP, and this act seems to simplify the complex task of writing the MRP. For a novice academic writer like Jie, the practice that came with writing the response papers seemed to function as a form of mediational means to navigate the MRP. The excerpt from her paper, as shown above, highlights how material artifacts such as the writing of response papers may have mediated her understanding of writing of a literature-based assignment such as the Mini Research Paper.

Jie received an A- grade on her MRP and her paper met requirements for many reasons: The paper presented an argument supported by evidence from various sources and displayed evidence of having thought carefully about the topic; evidence from source texts was analyzed, quoted, and/or paraphrased; the paper was organized with a thesis statement and had developed paragraphs with supporting details and topic sentences. An excerpt from her LRP integrating the literary text as a source of evidence is presented below:

The literary text *Into the Wild*, written by Jon Krakauer (1996) can also interpret the difference between the two societies perfectly. It is a story about an ordinary person who pursued his ultimate value of his life and realized his dream. Even the consequence would be regarded as a tragedy, but the protagonist-Christopher McCandless could be admired as a hero anyway. In
some situation, for ordinary people, realizing their dreams is not an easy task to some extent. There are countless obstacles on the way to their dreams. Giving up is a usual choice. Not everyone can grab the ultimate triumph by beating the cruel reality, which means that everyone who can realize his or her dream would suffer a struggling process and the courage and capacity to achieve the accomplishment is admired-worthy. It is not hard to understand and arouse sympathy in the individualist society. Hence what McCandless did is a kind of heroism, a individual heroism. Even though he did not rescue the world like the superheroes and paid his priceless life as price, but he reached his goal which is more important than anything. McCandless’s behavior is not advocated in the collectivist society. The truth is the aspects McCandless or his kind of heroes will consider are too narrow to get sublimated for his purposes. The collectivist culture needs the undaunted hero not a shallow-brained or idealistic person.

(Long Research Paper- 6/7/2010)

In this instance, Jie integrated the source text right at the beginning of the paragraph and followed through by weaving in evidence from the literary text systematically. Although the topic of her paper (variation in definition of heroes) was not directly related to the literary source text (Into the Wild), Jie managed to skillfully extract evidence from the literary text and integrate it into her paper through connecting explanations- a skill that was taught in the course. Some instructor comments that Jie received on her LRP were summative and were meant to offer an explanation for her grade: The topic was well-researched and evidence was well-integrated! The topic sentences were slightly vague and interfered with the flow of the paper. Jie displayed no apparent struggle with the integration of evidence aspect of her paper and seemed to skillfully integrate the literary source text, Into the Wild, into her own text to support her argument. Figure 5 below
attempts to capture the effects arising from Jie’s completion of the assignments preceding the LRP.
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Figure 5: The Mediating Function in Jie’s LRP

Figure 5 posits that Jie’s writing of the LRP may have been mediated by cultural resources in her learning environment. These resources could be in the form of material artifacts in the course such as the practice of writing response papers and the MRP, or symbolic tools such as language which enabled the dialogic conferences with the instructor. Language is a psychological tool that mediates development (Vygotsky, 1978) emphasized that; hence, in an instructional context, the instructor’s language to direct, or engage student’s participation builds and activates schemata, that is a form of mediation which prompts students to engage in a wide range of communicative activities (Lantolf, 2000). Hence, language functions as a sophisticated mediational mechanism in goal directed activities (Ahmed, 1994 cited in Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.158). To sum up, in
both her MRP and LRP, Jie displayed no apparent struggles with using the literary text as a source text.

The next section will address Jie’s performance on integrating a non-literary text as a source text as a counter-balance to her use of the literary text.

**Performance while Integrating the Non-Literary Text as a Source Text**

As mentioned previously, Jie used a combination of both literary and non-literary texts to support her argument in both the MRP and LRP. A non-literary text that Jie used in her MRP was an e-book, *Once Upon a Time- Together: An Intergenerational Reading Program Empowering TEENAGE Parents to Develop the Emerging Literacy of Their Children While Reducing their Own Literacy Deficiencies* by J.B Hoffman (1992).

Interestingly, Jie drew from but did not cite this source in the body of her paper, and she included it in her reference list, indicating some confusion on her part about citation practices. Perhaps this arose from confusion about how to cite e-based texts as opposed to more traditional texts. As will be seen in the example below, Jie consults this e-book source from which she borrows ideas, and although she does not provide an in-text citation of the source, she skillfully integrates evidence from the non-literary source text to back up her claim and wraps up her idea in the paragraph by tying it back to the main claim. The example below taken from her MRP shows Jie’s integration of the source content into her argument:

> From the example, it is evident that reading does have impact on young minds and is also very easy to act on their view of the world. There are many subjects of books. Apart from those academic works, romantic, adventure, fiction, whodunit, poem, biography and many other kinds could not be covered comprehensively. Different subject has different effect. Briefly,
romantic, adventure books may get young adults who lack of necessary interpretability addicted, because at this period of life, young adults easily get confused about all the information they receive, which is from a mass of views and be considered from many totally different standpoint. It is a problem for young adults to distinguish what is real and what is not, what should be trusted and what should not be and what is worthy to seriously take into account and what is just a joke. At this moment, a radical or a rebel view would be more attractive for the young minds. These unusual thoughts are much more appeal to them rather than those conservative minds. Further, this kind of minds appear frequently in the adventure, romantic and fiction books, for the reason that these sorts of books are more tolerant to contain themes like this. Assuming that a young adult lives in a family that could not satisfied him, he may turn to the book to seek for the comfort for himself. And imitate the behavior of the character in the books, because the ideal model can have unlimited influence on young adults who are in the crossroad of various choices.

In this instance, throughout the paragraph, Jie smoothly integrated evidence from her source text into the composition of her own text, thereby creating a cohesive and well constructed text that incorporated source texts. As mentioned in the previous section, the response papers seemed to mediate her practice of source integration, and the outline Jie created likely scaffolded the organizational structure of her argument, as illustrated in Figure 5.

Similarly, in her LRP, she displayed the same skill. Her LRP topic was “The different definition of hero under different cultural backgrounds.” In her paper, Jie argued that the definition of hero varies across cultures, and, using various examples, she attempted to point out the specific differences in what constitutes a hero in both individualistic and collectivist cultures. Prior to writing the Long Research Paper, in week 8, students received specific classroom instruction on how to integrate evidence to
support their claims and, the structure of claim-discussion of claim-evidence-explanation-concluding point proposed by Dollahite and Haun (2006) was explicitly taught. Jie met with the course instructor in an individual conference to receive feedback on her draft and received intervention that was "sensitive to the learner’s level of help required" (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994 p.468). Noting the benefits of one-to-one conferences with second language learners, Weissberg (2006 p.261) stated that writing conferences are an "unparalleled opportunity to provide targeted individualized instruction." In the example below, Jie (J) met with the instructor (I) to receive feedback on a draft of the LRP. A segment of Jie’s individual conference is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7:13</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>So, your thesis statement is right here “the definitions of hero can be distinguished …” is that right?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>You have a nice, strong thesis statement which states that your paper is based on the two notions of individualism and collectivism. Hence, the reader would logically expect you to discuss what you mean by these two notions- because remember that in the first half of the paper, you are laying the foundation for your reader. Hence the reader needs to know what these notions are (that you mentioned in your thesis). So, the two paragraphs here, where you start defining the two social formations, should be moved up to follow your introduction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tutorial with Jie- June 3, 2010)

As mentioned earlier, Jie’s Long Research Paper addressed the definition of heroes in different cultural backgrounds specifically, in individualist and collectivist cultures. Her thesis statement had addressed the notions of individualism and collectivism, but the definitions of these terms were stated towards the end of the paper. As can be seen in the example above, Jie received individual feedback from the instructor that emphasized the need to “provide enough contextual information to lay the foundation for the reader.”
Jie implemented this feedback in her paper and moved this crucial information to the front of her paper to follow her introduction. The example of her written text is below:

There are two definite diversity of social formation, which is collectivist society and individualist society. No one can deny that there are some similarities between these two social formations indeed. However, the definitions of hero can distinguish the difference. In collectivist society, people focus on the person who can sacrifice himself to make contributions to the society, while the people who have an individualist background would show their respect to those people who can live their own life and interpret their value by play their own role in work or family perfectly. Most Eastern countries, such as China, Japan and many Middle East countries pursue the principles of collectivism, whereas America, Australia and many countries in Europe can be classified as the countries with individualist background.

(Long Research Paper- 6/7/2010)

Through this face-to-face interaction, Jie received supportive intervention that provided her with new knowledge on audience awareness. Lantolf (2006) refers to this mediation from a supportive individual as the “other-regulation” stage that precedes the learner’s independent control of the task. From a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1989) “social interaction actually produces new, elaborate, and advanced psychological processes that are unavailable to the organism working in isolation” (p. 61) and hence, from the perspective of mediation, dialogue in writing conferences has been noted as a form of “scaffolding” for second language writers, which prompts them to revise their texts (Ewert, 2009; Weissberg, 2006) and eventually gain voluntary control of the task at hand (Lantolf, 2006).
In the following example below, she utilizes a non-literary text to show the difference between the two cultures. Taken from her LRP, the example is presented below:

According to Em Griffin (2006), *A First Look at Communication Theory*, there is a prevalent view to tell the difference of the two formations which depends on “the different ways the members of the societies perceive through self, goals and duty.” (p.441) Griffin also uses an example of an imaginary neighbor named Ed. Ed is in America, who was born into individualistic cultures, he may be have several identities such as a father and an employee. So every action he would take in his life perhaps is the action which can maximize his personal interests and get the best rewards to his life. On the contrary, if Ed was born in China, a typical collectivistic country, he is still a father and an employee for sure. But everything Ed does, would definitely not go against the group he serves for. Depending on the benefit of one group, he would devote himself to serve others in the group in order to meet the need of the group. As a father, Ed promised his loved daughter he would attend to watch her performance for a great evening event. Unfortunately, Ed’s company needs him to do a presentation for a new product which time will be conflict to his daughter’s performance. He will choose to do the presentation if he is in the collectivist society, because for the simple but critical reason that he cannot put the profit of his company- which is a bigger and more significant for him instead of family which is just a small group-into risk. And for the people live under the individualist society, the situation will reverse.

As can be seen in the example above, Jie not only paraphrases source material from a non-literary text effectively to support her argument, but she skillfully integrates it into her paper by providing connecting links back to her main claim and discussing the argument. As mentioned in the previous section, students in the course were instructed on how to skillfully integrate evidence into the paper prior to writing the LRP and received individual feedback on their draft from the instructor.
As an academic writer new to writing from sources, Jie used an effective cohesive structure throughout the paper, and integrated the non-literary source text into her argument. As mentioned earlier, semiotic resources in the form of material artifacts available in her social context (Lantolf, 2006) such as, the response papers, the MRP, and symbolic tools such as language that enabled dialogic conferences with the instructor, seem to be mediating elements that assisted her task of source-based writing. The above example seems to suggest that Jie demonstrated no apparent struggle with integrating a non-literary text into her argument and, in fact, her example demonstrates creativity due to the re-contextualization of information from her cultural context to her academic context. In this sense, by taking advantage of her cultural knowledge, she used individual and collectivist cultures as an angle of argument in her LRP, thus integrating the cultural domain with the academic domain.

**Summary of Jie’s Case**

The main purpose of this study was to investigate how novice academic writers navigate research-based writing, with a specific focus on their integration of literary and non-literary texts as source texts. Through a textual analysis of Jie’s written artifacts and through dialogic conferences with Jie, this chapter revealed that for Jie, as an academic writer of English new to source-based writing, the experience of learning how to write with a combination of literary and non-literary sources was a mixture of successes and challenges. A major theme that emerged from the findings was related to Jie’s apparent fluency and ease of integrating evidence from source texts regardless of the type of source texts. In Jie’s case, she used both literary and non-literary source texts as evidence
to support her argument, and in both her Mini and Long Research Paper, she seemed to skillfully integrate evidentiary support from both types of texts in both the assignments. Jie’s navigation of the MR and LRP seemed to be mediated by material artifacts and symbolic tools embedded in her social context (Lantolf, 2006). However, in both her MR and LRP, the findings reveal that Jie appeared to struggle with discursive elements of source-based writing such as organizational issues, the process of researching, and ineffective source use. Although Jie encountered some structural challenges while writing from sources, all of which could have been possibly generated by the instructional context, on both literary and non-literary associated tasks, there seemed to be no noticeable difference or struggle in specifically using either literary or non-literary source texts. The following chapter 5 will present the case of the second participant in this study, Randy and provide a detailed contextualized perspective on how he navigated the academic discursive practice of source-based writing using a variety of source text types.
CHAPTER 5
THE CASE OF RANDY

Introduction

One of the biggest challenges second language (L2) writers face is composing their own texts using source texts, a skill or set of skills that represents an important stage in the development of academic writing competency for both L1 and L2 writers. Quite a few studies have provided evidence to show that multilingual students struggle with reorganizing data from multiple sources in ways that are appropriate to the assigned task (Johns, 1985b, 1986; Swales, 1982). Using Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of mediation extended by Lantolf (2006), this study examines how each participant navigated the complex academic task of research-based writing using a combination of literary and nonliterary sources. This combination sets it apart from previous studies, which have generally looked at research-based writing using only nonliterary texts. As seen previously, Chapter 4 presented the case of Jie and identified her successes and challenges in the discursive practice of writing from multiple sources. Using a qualitative analysis that combines ethnographic approaches to the study of written texts, the current chapter will provide a detailed description of how Randy, a novice academic multilingual writer, engaged the same multisource reading and writing tasks Jie faced. The data for this chapter come from Randy’s journals, written artifacts such as his major papers for
the course (including feedback from the instructor), his response papers, his contributions to online forums, and interviews conducted during tutorials with the course instructor.

Lantolf’s (2006) perspective of mediation theory was used as a lens to understand how the semiotic mechanisms such as signs and tools that are embedded in everyday practices have the potential to possibly mediate the navigation of academic literacy practices. In Lantolf’s view, one form of mediation is regulation (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) and according to his perspective, individuals go through various stages of first “being controlled by objects in their environment, then by others in their environment and finally they gain control over their own social and cognitive activities” (p.6). Thus, through regulation, individuals have the capacity to voluntarily and intentionally gain control over the task they are engaged in. Lantolf and Pavlenko (2001) explain that “learners actively engage in constructing the terms and conditions of their own learning…” and “it is agency that links motivation to action and defines a myriad of paths taken by learners” (pp.145-146). In other words, learners construct agency through participation in an activity and in doing so, find new ways to mediate themselves and their relationships.

In what follows, I provide a detailed description of how Randy navigated the academic discursive practice of writing from both literary and nonliterary sources, revealing where he struggled and where he succeeded in his attempts to gain command of this practice. This is done by examining a number of themes and issues which arose in the qualitative textual analysis of his participation in the writing activities of the 108.01 course.
Background Information about Randy

Randy was an international student from Indonesia who came to America as a transfer student. He had spent two and a half years at Seattle Central Community College, from where he transferred to the current university to study Architecture. Hence, he was a third year student in the university. He was of the opinion that universities in Indonesia were not as competitive as American universities; as a result, he was determined to get an undergraduate degree from an American university. In his initial interview with me, he stated that “I came as a transfer student because Indonesia is still a developing country, so there is no good university like in America – my university does not even rank 100” (Interview with Randy, April 14, 2010). After arriving in Seattle, Randy took the College English placement test and was placed into an ESL writing course which focused on reading, critical thinking and participation skills that students needed to prepare for university.

Randy was raised in a rich linguistic environment and spoke Indonesian, Javanese and English fluently, and was minimally competent in Mandarin. He learned Indonesian and Javanese, two local languages in his home country, during his primary school years and learned English as a foreign language in secondary school. Indonesia is included as an “expanding circle country” (Kachru, 1985) where English is considered a foreign language and plays no role in the government. Instead, it is taught in secondary school with a view of preparing students to access scientific knowledge and technology, communicate internationally, and succeed in a global environment (Lauder, 2008). Due to his Chinese heritage, his parents often encouraged him to learn Mandarin on the
weekends. The coexistence and uses of different languages in his native country allowed Randy to become multilingual. Randy came across as a diligent student who regularly participated in class; he loved to talk and was always conversational in our meetings. As will be seen later, Randy seemed to display a high level of motivation and seemed to have a positive attitude towards learning, which may have helped his navigation of complex academic discursive practices.

**Academic Literacy Experiences**

At the time of the study, Randy majored in Architecture and was enrolled in five different courses: two Architecture courses, Hebrew, ESL Composition, and Soccer. Thus, he was faced with the challenge of having to navigate the various literacy demands each setting presented (Lea & Street, 2000). In his initial interview, Randy positioned himself as an individual who practiced his Christian faith and hence, he enrolled in a Hebrew course in order to learn about the use of ancient Hebrew in the Old Testament. It also fulfilled his General Elective requirement in the Architecture program (Interview with Randy – April 14, 2010). Randy reported several difficulties he encountered in making sense of the complex academic texts in his architecture courses and hoped that the ESL Composition would prepare him for reading and writing in his other course. In one of his journals, he wrote:

> I have another ongoing research paper for my architecture history class. It is motivating and challenging to find the history facts of my building object... Thanks to ENG 108 class discussing research paper, will undoubtedly have me understood what the big picture of well-made research paper should be. I am really looking forward to get learn about research paper.

(Journal # 4, April 20, 2010)
In another journal entry, he stated similar expectations of the course:

Fortunately, I also take Architecture history class this quarter which requires me to read the weekly readings and asks me to do a 5 page-research paper about particular architecture building. Therefore, ENG 108 has given me the perfect time to apply the knowledge into this history class.

(Journal # 6, May 19, 2010)

From the above quotes, we can see Randy’s expectations of the ESL writing course and his reliance on the course to prepare him for writing in other disciplines. It may highlight that Randy perceived the academy to be “a homogenous culture whose norms and practices simply have to be learned to provide access to the whole institution” (Jones, Turner & Street, p.xxi). Moreover, he seemed to have understood academic literacy learning to be a set of decontextualized skills that he could transfer to a various settings to successfully complete written tasks and thus came with a set of expectations to the course. Randy took the previous ESL 107.01 Composition course in the department which addressed several academic writing skills such as expressing opinions, organizing discourse, integrating source texts, paraphrasing, summarizing, critical review papers, grammar exercises, reflective writing (107.01 course syllabus).

In the sections that follow, themes and issues related to Randy’s academic reading and writing experiences, especially his source-based writing in the 108.01 course, are explored. This includes some focus on his experiences in courses other than the 108.01 course so as to provide additional context for analysis of how he approached his literacy activities in 108.01.
Reading Experiences Related to Source-based Writing

Randy's reading experience was limited and prior to reading the assigned literary text, *Into the Wild*, he had read two books in English: a Harry Potter novel by J.K. Rowling and *The Purpose-driven Life* by Rick Warren. Based on my in and out-of-class interactions with Randy as well as his personal accounts, he did not seem to particularly enjoy reading, but when he did, the types of texts he was most drawn to were non-fiction, fiction, and historical. He reported that he had poor reading skills despite living in an English speaking country for two and a half years, and was disappointed that his reading skills had shown no improvement. He believed that he often spent more time on reading than his native English speaker peers and was curious as to why international students struggled with reading in English so much. To echo this sentiment, he wrote the following in one of his journals:

To be honest, I really suck at reading so that I always use much more time than the others (Americans). One of my American friends once told me that he got a quiz for the next hour but he didn’t seem to be panic at all. I asked him whether because of his confidence for having all of his readings done or any reasons make him feel comfortable of the quiz. However, his answer shocked me well; that he has not read them at all and only have one hour to finish his twenty-pages -single-spaced reading. It is just wow!

(Journal # 2, April 18, 2010)

From the above journal entry, it can be inferred that Randy’s negative self-perception of his reading abilities arose in comparison to his native-English speaking peer and may have influenced his academic reading practices as he negotiated writing from various source texts.
Randy’s reaction to both the literary and nonliterary source texts in the course seemed to be quite positive, given his general lack of interest in reading; in fact, he did not seem to demonstrate any major struggle with reading both the literary text *Into the Wild* and nonliterary texts assigned in the ESL course and showed no preference for either text type. In the 108.01 course, he had to read the weekly assigned chapters in the text *Into the Wild* in addition to five articles over the course of five weeks. As for the literary text, Randy stated that he initially found the novel to be slightly challenging because he had trouble “adapting to the author’s style of writing” (Journal #1, April 11, 2010); however, once he became captivated by the mysterious death of Christopher McCandless, he became motivated to read and delve deeper into the story to find out more. He reported that he gradually found the story easy to understand and could easily guess the meaning of unfamiliar words. He elaborates on this in his journal:

The way the author introduces the setting of the places Chris McCandless had been to in each chapter gives us a very well described imagination in our head. Besides, the vocabularies are not that difficult to follow and can be guessed without knowing the meaning in dictionaries.

(Journal #1, April 11, 2010).

Randy reported finding the literary text easy to navigate because of its story-like format which allowed him to guess the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary and piece together the complete picture. In fact, he seemed to recognize the value in reading literary texts and often stated that he could gain and learn useful knowledge, vocabulary, slang words and grammatical constructions from reading the texts. This positive attitude towards reading may have positively impacted his writing from sources and may have helped prepare him to write more effectively (Hirvela, 2004).
Although he did not report to be necessarily passionate about reading the novel, he described it to be an “interesting and a must-read book.” He engaged himself in the reading process by often questioning the actions of McCandless and analyzing the author’s strategies. In the example below, he wrote a more author-focused response and analyzed the author’s strategies and moves in presenting crucial information in the story.

In his response paper, he stated:

Unfortunately, the way author presents the story line, especially the eighth chapter, is disappointing owing to the existence of other three minor characters all of sudden. The author does a great job on the chapter seven revealing Chris’ personalities and conflicts with his friends in Carthage.

(Response # 4, April 27, 2010)

From the example above, it can be seen that, unlike Jie, who focused her analysis on the main character and the story, while reading Randy, chose to analyze the author’s strategy of writing more than the story and the character itself. In a way, this highlights his sense of audience awareness by focusing his attention on how writers adapt their writing for various purposes and to meet the audience’s needs (Elbow, 1981; Flower & Hayes, 1980). Moreover, it can be gleaned from Randy’s response papers that, unlike Jie, he rarely made personal connections with the story or character in the text; rather, his analysis was more objective and author-focused. Perhaps this could be due to individual differences in the reading process, as reading may vary based on individual strategies, motivations for reading and attitude towards the L2 (Grabe, 1999; Hirvela, 2001) which may have eventually impacted his use of the literary text in his writing assignments.

Randy seemed to take charge of his reading and activated several metacognitive strategies (Anderson, 1991) to facilitate his reading of the literary text Into the Wild
which highlights a sense of “agency” (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001) in his learning process. For example, when he came across vocabulary that was unfamiliar, he often tried to guess the meaning of the word in context. At times, he highlighted unfamiliar vocabulary and looked up the meaning of the words in the dictionary and wrote down the exact meaning. Moreover, his readings showed evidence of reflective comments, summary and marginal notations (Hirvela, 2004). In other words, he was using writing to mediate reading. For instance, in the novel Into the Wild, when Jim Gallien, a truck driver who gives Chris McCandless a ride, asked him if he had a hunting license, Chris responded “How I feed myself is none of the government’s business” (p. 6). Randy’s interpretation and marginal notation of this interaction was, “anti-social, he’s rebelling against the government.” In another instance, in the margin of a dialogue between Gallien and McCandless, Randy wrote, “Gallien knew this guy is troublesome” (p.6). In other chapters of the text, Randy summarized the central idea of each paragraph and briefly noted the main idea in the margins. By employing metacognitive strategies and monitoring his reading activity, Randy seemed to assume agency in his learning process and appeared to “self-regulate” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) his reading activity by using writing as a mediational mechanism to facilitate his reading. Identifying crucial discourse elements of the texts he read, suggests that Randy engaged with the text at a deep level which may have positively impacted his ability to write about the text in his research paper.

As for reading nonliterary source texts, he relied heavily on Google and the internet for his sources and in his journal, appreciated the internet for saving him the time and inconvenience of physically having to locate sources. He states, “the books I want, I
can just Google the preview of the book. If it does not provide enough information, I can buy from half.com/amazon.com” (Journal # 3, April 20, 2010). Similar to his positive experiences with the literary source text, Randy did not seem to struggle with using nonliterary source texts either; however, he commented on his inclination to choose source texts based on the length of text. For example, in his journal, he wrote, “an article is obvious whether it can be related or not because it is shorter and usually discuss specific topics than novel… As an international student, I will choose a shorter article which has the obvious evidences related to research topic.” (Journal # 5, May 13th, 2010).

As a novice academic writer and multilingual student, when researching sources, Randy seemed inclined to use sources that were easy to locate and shorter in length. His preference for shorter texts echoes findings in Nelson and Hayes’ research (1988) in which they found that while researching sources, some of their participants, consisting of L1 upper class freshmen and advanced college writers, preferred more general comprehensive books with condensed treatments of the topic in order to avoid reading too much. However in the specific context of Randy who was an L2 writer, linguistic and cultural barriers may have added to a significant degree of difficulty while reading (Spack, 1998, p. 97) thus creating an additional challenge for him. This finding may highlight that length of text may matter to inexperienced writers as longer texts may add to the burden of processing information (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991). Moreover, as seen in the above quote, Randy seemed to prefer source texts that directly related to his research topic; hence, how and why writers choose certain source texts may not be so
straightforward, as their choice may be based more on convenience or may be related to the academic task at hand.

The following section sheds light on Randy’s navigation of the Mini (MRP) and Long Research Paper (LRP) assignments, focusing specifically on his response to and use of the literary source text *Into the Wild* and nonliterary source texts. As will be seen, he seems to navigate the integration of using both types of texts smoothly when writing from sources.

**Taking on a New Genre: The Mini Research Paper**

Since writing in the disciplines encompasses a variety of writing assignments that may involve summarizing articles, constructing research papers and critiquing texts (Braine, 1995; Leki & Carson, 1997; Carson, 2001), much of EAP instruction has been focused on helping students acquire universal academic writing skills that involve paraphrasing, summarizing and synthesizing information from various text sources. The need to equip students with this specialized type of academic literacy highlights the significance of genre and discipline-specific literacy practices that students need to learn in order to be successful readers and writers in their academic courses (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Sutton, 1997). As Randy moved from writing response papers to a more complex discursive practice of writing a research paper in the course, he encountered a variation in the types of literacy practice he was required to engage in. Moreover, as the course introduced students to a combination of literary and nonliterary source texts, Randy had to now navigate this challenge of using both types of source texts to support his argument.
Randy appeared to be actively involved in his navigation of source-based writing practices. He was not reluctant to email his queries and concerns and communicate with the instructor about forthcoming assignments. As a highly motivated student, he preferred to complete his assignments ahead of the deadline to avoid procrastination. For example, early in the 108.01 course, he requested permission to submit assignments before the deadline in order to receive feedback and make any necessary changes that would improve his writing. As a novice academic writer, he had never written a research paper before and was, therefore, determined to do well. After skimming through the course syllabus, Randy was eager to complete a draft of the Mini Research Paper and initiated several questions about the assignment well in advance. For example, in one of his emails to the instructor, he wrote,

Is this the final research paper? Is this still the draft? Could you please elaborate it more specifically? I am afraid that I will misunderstand this assignment. How many pages do you need? And in what date? I want to get this thing done asap before my architecture midterms start.

(Email sent by Randy to the Instructor – April 20, 2010)

As can be seen in the above email, as a novice multilingual writer new to the genre of research-writing, Randy was highly anxious and concerned about misunderstanding the assignment; therefore he sought clarification eagerly in advance by interacting with the instructor in order to ensure that he followed all the guidelines of the assignment correctly. Composing in a second language can be quite complex (Spack, 1988) and as seen in Randy’s experience, the MRP assignment seemed to confuse him initially. However, he sought to rectify his confusion by interacting with available social resources (such as the instructor) in his environment. In other words, Randy’s involvement in his
learning process seems to highlight his dynamic and involved approach to navigating a new genre.

As a novice academic writer, Randy was new to the genre of writing a research paper and was excited to begin working on his Mini Research Paper. His topic was “The Significance of Mind Power in Climbing.” He was eager to begin writing the MRP and began the process of researching his topic and sources well in advance. For instance, in his journal, he wrote:

> It has been my privilege for me to start doing mini research project as it gives me such an opportunity to explore the topic I have wondered for times. I therefore have started this research since last week. Two-days of experimenting my topic has resulted me successfully finish a draft which consists of introduction as well as the thesis, two main body paragraphs, a conclusion and one page of reference list.

(Journal # 4, May 4, 2010)

The above entry seems to provide an interesting starting point in looking at his successes with source-text integration. Randy seemed to prepare for the MRP well in advance which showed how he sought to exercise control over performing in his writing task. Moreover, as a novice academic writer, his attention to macro-level aspects of academic writing such as the structure of the paper, a thesis statement, and a reference list, seem to underscore his recognition of crucial discursive components of the writing task and demonstrate a keenness to socialize into academic discourse. He received an A on his MRP and some instructor comments he received were: *Clear thesis and great topic sentences. Overall the paper was interesting to read. Evidence was well-integrated and well-explained. Keep up the good work.* As noted in Chapter Four, the MRP required students to use two sources from the course and two external sources which students had
to locate independently. The purpose of including two external sources was to give students an opportunity to search for and evaluate sources independently. The literary text *Into the Wild* was not a required source text in the MR paper and, unlike Jie, Randy did not use *Into the Wild* as a source text in his mini research paper. Instead, he chose to use another literary text as well as three non-literary source texts to support his argument. See Table 9 below for the source texts he used.

Table 9: Name and Type of Source texts used in the MRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Name of source text</th>
<th>Type of source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini Research Paper</td>
<td>The Transcendence Zone. Where the mountain casts its shadow by Maria Coffey (2003).</td>
<td>Literary text (Book chapter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaching New Heights by Veronica Meyer (2007).</td>
<td>Non-literary text (Magazine article)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Everest: History/facts. <a href="http://www.mteverest.net/history/html">www.mteverest.net/history/html</a></td>
<td>Non-literary text (website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Into Thin Air: Death on Everest</em> by R. Markowitz (1997)</td>
<td>Non-literary text (Film)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 9, Randy used three non-literary texts and a chapter from a literary source text that did not include *Into the Wild*. Although he found *Into the Wild* easy to read and enjoyed the story, he did not select it as a source text in his Mini Research Paper. In his journal, he explains why:

I did not use my ‘Into the Wild’ novel as a source because I thought this novel did not obviously relate to my topic. If we explore Chris’ attitude and feeling, of course it can show the proof of mind power that I am looking for; but it is just not so-evident. …Moreover, if there were two choices between book—which has the same title as I want to explore, and novel; I would still choose the book.

(Journal # 5, May 13, 2010)
From the above quote, Randy felt that the material in the literary text *Into the Wild* did not seem to relate to his argument in his MRP and he was looking for specific information in source texts that was related to his argument. It is important to note that Randy was not reluctant to use a literary text in his paper and in fact he used a book chapter (used in the course) from Coffey’s *The Transcendence Zone* that was related to his research topic of mind power. In discerning between using articles as source texts or the literary text as a source text, Randy noted the following:

> If both of them are the sources I should pick one of them, my choice will go to the articles. In my opinion, the difference is a novel consists of many topics – which not all the topics can be related to particular topic we want to explore. An article is obvious whether it can be related or not because it is shorter and usually discuss specific topics than novel.

(Journal # 5, May 13, 2010)

Interestingly, the above quote demonstrates his sophistication in selection of information from source texts, since he was able to discriminate carefully between sources. Randy used three nonliterary source texts to support the argument in his MRP, as he found that they were directly related to his topic. The above quote once again shows Randy’s preference for source texts that were connected to his topic of inquiry. Seemingly, Randy’s choice of source texts while writing the MRP was related to the academic task at hand (Greene, 1991), and did not in any way indicate his general attitude toward a particular text type.

As for integrating non-literary texts into his MRP, Randy effectively paraphrased, quoted and integrated source texts to support his claim. An example of this source integration from his MRP is below:
Mind power has also a great impact at maximizing physical potential. It has been human nature to try other challenges once there is a proof they are able to do it. Because of the breaking news by Edmund Hillary in 1953 back then, people have tried more challenging ways to reach summit. According to www.mnteverest.net, Peter Habeler successfully reached the summit without oxygen in 1978 and Mark Batard even wanted to try it within 24 hours. Another surprising fact from the article, “Reaching New Heights”, a recipient with an implant mechanical heart had also conquered the summit of Everest. “I am one of fewer than 2,500 people to reach the peak of Mount Everest and one of fewer than 250 people to successfully climb the “Seven Summits”… with a mechanical heart valve” (Meyer, 2007, para.12). Looking back at the past, no one with such a disability would ever try to conquer the Everest peak unless the first normal human successfully reached it first. Therefore, it would never be a surprise if numerous of people try various tough ways to get on to the top of the world. Once a person has done it, other people will have a mindset that they should also be able to do it.

(Randy- Mini Research Paper - May 7, 2010)

As can be seen in the above paragraph, Randy clearly states his claim in his topic sentence and, subsequently, integrates his non-literary textual evidence, which is a website in this case, to provide examples of two other men who were inspired by Edmund Hillary to climb Mt. Everest. He uses another non-literary text, in this case, a magazine article by Veronica Meyers, to support his claim further and provided connecting evidence that ties back to his claim. As can be seen above, Randy extracts an interesting quotation as evidence to argue his point of how mind power can overcome any physical limitation. Finally, he sums up his claim and concludes his paragraph for the reader.

Especially when the course had not yet specifically covered how to integrate evidence at this stage, as a novice academic writer new to the genre of writing a research paper, Randy’s paragraph taken from his MRP demonstrates how he effectively weaved
in two nonliterary source texts to support his argument. By providing contextual
information on the material taken from the source text, he showed an awareness of
audience, which some researchers consider central to the process of composing (Elbow,
1981; Flower & Hayes, 1980). Randy also used specific topic sentences which assisted
the organization and flow of his ideas.

On the whole, as a novice writer he illustrated a skilful composition by integrating
source texts to writing to suit his rhetorical purpose. It is important to note that Randy
wanted to ensure that he adopted the right approach to writing this new genre and sought
instructor intervention early on at various stages of writing the MRP. For example, while
other students submitted only a final copy of their MRP, Randy wrote two drafts and
sought the instructor’s feedback on his drafts prior to submitting his final version. Some
comments he received on his two prior drafts were: *Your paper relies too much on
evidence, and hence, needs a discussion of borrowed material to relate it to your
argument. Moreover, some of your sources don’t seem to support your argument. Topic
sentences would help improve the flow of your paper* (MRP draft 2 feedback). In his
journal entry, he recognized the usefulness of seeking feedback on his drafts and wrote:

I used to use some external sources as my main source, which came from
bestseller books. I chose them because it has been my thought to consider
them as a well-proved source….Thanks to my instructor’s feedback, I
realized some of those sources did not support my topic well. Hence, I
replaced some unnecessary external sources …which surely has given me
a positive development towards my paper.

(Journal # 4, May 4, 2010)

Thus, Randy attempted to navigate a genre that was new to him by interactively engaging
with the instructional context. In this sense, he “regulated” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) his
learning and viewed the instructor as a resource in his social context and dynamically engaged in a socially meaningful activity to fulfill his need (Leont’ev, 1981). This finding is consistent with findings in Riazi’s study (1997) of Iranian doctoral students who relied extensively on “interacting with members of their discourse community as strategies for seeking clarification and comments” (p.127). In using a constructivist perspective, Riazi found that these strategies helped novice multilingual writers at the graduate level take control over their writing tasks. Figure 5 below represents the mediating function in Randy’s navigation of the MRP.

![Figure 5: The Mediating Function in Randy’s MRP](image)

Within the sociocultural perspective, just as individuals use technical tools for manipulating their environment, they use psychological tools for directing and controlling their physical and mental behavior (Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.8). Mediation takes place in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) through the means of scaffolding which is described as the “role of teachers and others in supporting the learner’s development and providing support structures to get to that next stage or level” (Raymond, 2000, p. 176). However, in working with the ZPD, “it is not the successful
completion of task that is of importance, but “the higher cognitive process that emerges as a result of the interaction” (Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.10). Within this framework, language functions as a psychological tool and a “sophisticated mediational mechanism in goal directed activities” (Ahmed, 1994 cited in Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.158). Figure 5 posits how semiotic resources available in Randy’s social context in the form of instructional resources seemed to mediate his navigation of source-based writing.

According to Lantolf and Pavlenko, (2001) learners construct agency through participation in an activity and in doing so, find new ways to mediate themselves and their relationships. Randy’s dynamic and interactive approach to the new genre, suggests that he took an agentive approach in navigating the complex elements of the MRP.

**Randy’s Navigation of the Long Research Paper**

Once again as Randy moved from writing the MRP to a slightly more challenging discursive practice of writing the Long Research Paper (LRP) in the course, he encountered a new assignment with specific requirements. The Long Research Paper (LRP), which required students to use at least four to five resources to support an argument on a topic of their choice, exemplifies this view of the acquisition of academic literacies skills. Although variation in the requirements for this new assignment would be a new challenge for Randy, he seemed to take it in his stride and show flexibility in adapting to this new requirement. Randy chose the topic of “Risk-taking personalities-Nature vs. Nurture” in his LRP out of sheer interest of wanting to learn more about the subject; thus, similar to his MRP, he started the process of researching well in advance. To support his claims, Randy used a combination of both the assigned literary text in the
course and various nonliterary texts accessed electronically. These represented a significantly multimodal approach to the assignment, as shown in Table 10 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Name of source text</th>
<th>Type of source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk-taking: Is it in our genes? The Daily Helmsman Online by J. Appling (2007),</td>
<td>Non-literary text (electronic newspaper article)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing your Emotions by Joyce Meyer (1997)</td>
<td>Non-literary text (e-article)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 10, Randy used five sources to support his paper: four non-literary texts and one literary text- *Into the Wild*. As explained in Chapter Four, prior to writing the Long Research Paper, in week eight, students received classroom instruction on how to integrate evidence to support their argument and were taught to write paragraphs using the structure of claim- discussion- evidence- explanation- concluding point proposed by Dollahite and Haun (2006) in the course textbook *Writing from Sources*. Randy received an A on his LRP and some instructor comments he received were as follows: *Your paper was not only informative but also very interesting to read- it demonstrated strong researching skills. The paper was well-organized and sources well-integrated… Good job integrating evidence from the text.* (Feedback on LRP- June 6,
An excerpt from his Long Research Paper integrating the literary text as a source of evidence is presented below:

However, nurture also influences people to be risk-takers based on their personal experiences, specifically when they are seeking sensations. According to Marvin Zuckerman (2000) in his article, “Are you a risk taker?, who has spent more than 20 years researching personality traits in human being, risk taking personality itself is not the main attraction of sensation seekers. Rather, it is the cost they have to take in pursuing the excitement and experiences (Zuckerman, 2000, para. 6). In other words, this sensation-seeking might be considered to have people ignore the risk for the sake of experiences and satisfactions they look for. Another example showing that sensation seeking plays the important role is the story of Chris McCandless, a pitiful youth found dead in the wilderness of Alaska. As the chapter goes, Jon Krakauer (1997) reveals Chris’s past after he knew the fact all the lies his parents had hidden from him (Krakauer, 1997, p.121). This story has shown to the readers that he sought escapism through sensation seeking. His desire to go into wilderness can illustrate the reader that Chris tried to look for satisfactions as his ambition to forget what his parents had done on him in the past from the way he enjoyed the excitement of dangerous adventure.

As mentioned earlier, one of the unique features of this EAP course had to do with the fact that the students were exposed to a combination of both literary and nonliterary texts which they had to use as source texts. As can be seen in the above example from his LRP, Randy responded well to the use of both types of source texts and effectively weaved in evidence from both types of texts, to support his claims. In fact, his choice of evidence seems to indicate that Randy researched the literary source text carefully and extracted relevant evidence to suit his rhetorical purpose (Spivey, 1997), which may likely be a positive impact of the reading strategies he employed while reading Into the Wild and which may highlight the interdependence of reading and writing processes (Grabe, 1991;
Hirvela, 2004; Spack, 1988; Stotsky, 1983; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). In the course and for the purpose of this study, the effectiveness of how well he integrated source texts was measured and analyzed using Dollahite and Haun’s (2006) source integration structure taught in the course and along with other discoursal features that promote coherence and cohesiveness in academic writing.

In another example, Randy performed similarly well on specifically integrating a non-literary source text. In the following example below, he utilizes a non-literary text to show how nature may be a contributing factor in risk-taking personalities. Taken from his LRP, the example is presented below:

Nature aspect should be considered to be the main contribution of risk taking character owing to the possibility of DNA distinction in DRD4 (Dopamine Receptor D4) is inheritable. According to Dr. William Dwyer (Appling, 2007), a University of Memphis psychology professor then explains that this kind of personality derives from heritage of DNA distinction in DRD4 gene, indirectly gives a spirit of having the excitement from adrenaline pumping whenever individuals do these dangerous activities (Appling, 2007, par. 6). His statement clearly claims that some people are naturally born with the enjoyment of fear and thrill so that they are able to comfort their body in danger. Just like drugs, fear and thrill can be an addiction for certain people and inheritable owing to this DNA. A great example showing that this DNA exists, from a 27-year-old former Marine, Jake, who has hobbies in 202 mph-desert-racing and skydiving. He admitted that risky activities are hobbies and crucial part on his life during his tour in Iraq. "No matter how many times you do it, your heart just flutters… even after 105 jumps you still feel the same way each time. It's like after sex. I always need a cigarette." (As cited in Appling, 2007, para. 4).

As can be seen in the example above, Randy stated his claim and supported it by integrating evidence from a non-literary source text by Appling (2007). He not only paraphrased information from the source, but also further explained it in his own words to demonstrate his understanding of the borrowed material, which several researchers have documented to be generally challenging for L2 writers (Campbell, 1990; Pecorari, 2003; Shi, 2004). Moreover, he later provided a specific example from the same source text to exemplify how some individuals are born with a thrill-seeking desire and effectively integrated evidence in the form of a quotation to support his point. Contrary to some studies in L2 research that have reported writers having a significant degree of difficulty in using sources (Pecorari, 2003; Howard, 2000), Randy seemed to have extracted evidence from the source and efficiently paraphrased material to suit his rhetorical purpose. In her article, “Negotiating Academic Discourse,” Flower (1990) highlights some critical features of academic writing and writes:

The goals of self-directed critical inquiry, of using writing to think through genuine problems and issues, and of writing to an imagined community of peers with a personal rhetorical purpose—these distinguish academic writing.(p.32)

She further points out that two common challenges that students face in negotiating various academic practices are: “integrating information from sources with one's own knowledge and 2) interpreting one's reading/ adapting one's writing for a purpose” (p.8). These practices she argues are considered to be critical features of academic discourse that may limit full participation of novice writers in the academic community. However, as seen in Randy’s case, he seemed to have negotiated these practices effectively and responded to the use of both literary and nonliterary source texts in his argument. Within
the context of L2 writing, what this seems to suggest is that as a novice academic and multilingual writer, Randy was adaptive in his writing and seemed to show flexibility in negotiating the complex elements of source-based writing.

Specifically, from Lantolf’s perspective of mediation (2000), semiotic resources in the form of instructional resources or material artifacts available in the immediate environment of the learner may have possibly mediated Randy’s navigation of the task. Students in the course were encouraged to write in drafts and receive individual feedback from the instructor. Specifically, as an active participant in his learning, Randy “actively engaged in constructing the terms and conditions of his own learning” (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001 p.145) in his learning and wrote several drafts for instructor feedback prior to his final submission. Not only did this approach of writing drafts help him gain “genre awareness” (Johns, 2008) which is described as “rhetorical flexibility necessary for adapting their socio-cognitive genre knowledge to ever-changing contexts” (p.238), but also, it made him alter his use of strategies to write effectively for the audience. Thus, he sought instructional resources available in his social context to mediate his navigation of the LRP. Additionally, the MRP seemed to have provided the mediational means and self-scaffolded his learning to apply some of his experiences in navigating the LRP. He makes this explicit in his journal entries:

Fortunately, having done my first mini research paper has opened my eyes widely that it is a more advanced level of paper which we have to do it with better plan and to be detail-oriented

(Journal # 5, May 13, 2010).

In another journal entry, he states:
My writing skills, specifically in deciding appropriate strategies for research paper, such as: perfect thesis, the significance of first sentence in each body paragraphs has been improving. Starting with research questions, topics and focuses has given me the appropriate strategies to have a great research paper.

I can apply what I got from mini research paper to final research paper. Now I feel more confident and prepared to do it. The experiences of the MR paper have changed my strategies in doing a long paper.

(Journal # 6, May 19, 2010)

These entries seem to show that Randy’s experiences in writing the MRP may have mediated his navigation of the LRP as he strategically approached his LRP and used learning experiences from his MRP to navigate a different setting. Moreover, writing the MRP seemed to have provided the practice and immersion (Zamel & Spack, 1998) that L2 writers benefit from while attempting new and complex genres such as research-based writing. Zamel (1998) contends that “the process of acquisition is slow-paced and continues to evolve with exposure, immersion and involvement … in the construction of meaning and knowledge (p.260).

Upon receiving written feedback on his LRP drafts, Randy met with the instructor in an individual face-to-face conference to discuss the feedback. From a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978), language learners co-construct L2 knowledge through social interaction, which “actually produces new, elaborate, and advanced psychological processes that are unavailable to the organism working in isolation” (Vygotsky, 1989 p. 61). Hence, language used in collaborative dialogue through social interaction is seen to mediate language learning (Swain, 2000) and provide comprehensible input to language learners; thus, it recognizes the importance of dialogue as a cognitive tool to mediate
language development. The following session below is an example of Randy’s learning experience in which he learns the importance of contextualizing source text information for his reader. The discussion below is between the Instructor (I) and Randy (R) and is based on a Long Research Paper draft that Randy brought in for feedback. An excerpt from this individual conference is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.36</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>You need to introduce the source clearly to your reader and not just mention the author’s name.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Sorry but that is what I want to ask you because I thought I only mentioned the source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>No, I mean, the author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>You need to offer your reader some background about this source. As in, who is this Marvin you write about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>So do you think I should say According to Zuckerman?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>From what I see here, you wrote, “In his article “Are you risk-taker”, Marvin explains ……Be sure to give the reader some information about his expertise. Give us some background in the form of a one-sentence summary on the article perhaps. This is a good source that would make your paper stronger.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Conference with Randy – June 3, 2010)

In this specific instance, when introducing the source for the first time, Randy had provided only the author’s first name and the name of the article on his draft without giving the reader a short summary of the article and mentioning the author’s expertise on the subject. Through a collaborative exchange with the instructor, Randy seemed to have understood the importance of providing some context for his source and incorporated this feedback into his subsequent draft. The example of this integrated new knowledge is reflected in the text below taken from his final draft:

However, nurture also influences people to be risk-takers based on their personal experiences, specifically when they are seeking sensations. According to Marvin Zuckerman (2000) in his article, “Are you a risk taker?, who has spent more than 20 years researching personality traits in human being, risk taking
personality itself is not the main attraction of sensation seekers. Rather, it is the cost they have to take in pursuing the excitement and experiences (Zuckerman, 2000, para. 6). In other words, this sensation-seeking might be considered to have people ignore the risk for the sake of experiences and satisfactions they look for.


As can be seen in the above text, Randy incorporated the instructor’s feedback into his final draft by giving the reader some background information about the source and author, which might suggest that he may have gained new knowledge and learned the importance of providing contextual information on his sources. We can say this because Randy not only incorporated this feedback in this specific example, but also went one step further and incorporated it in all other examples in his LRP. Another example taken from his LRP, in which he provides contextual information on his sources, is below:

Nature aspect should be considered to be the main contribution of risk taking character owing to the possibility of DNA distinction in DRD4 (Dopamine Receptor D4) is inheritable. According to Dr. William Dwyer (Appling, 2007), a University of Memphis psychology professor then explains that this kind of personality derives from heritage of DNA distinction in DRD4 gene, indirectly gives a spirit of having the excitement from adrenaline pumping whenever individuals do these dangerous activities (Appling, 2007, par. 6).


Dialogue in writing conferences has been noted as a form of “scaffolding” for second language writers, which prompts them to revise their texts (Weissberg, 2006; Ewert, 2009). The instructor’s oral and written feedback on his draft functioned as a mediational mechanism and appeared to extend Randy’s existing knowledge. Specifically, semiotic mediation in the form of language, plays an important role not only in allowing collaboration between participants but also in assisting mental development through
appropriation of “inter-mental semiotic processes” (Wells, 1999 p.102). Therefore, as Wells puts it, it is talk that mediates the various modes of knowing within a culture.

Figure 7 below, represents the likely mediating sources in Randy’s navigation of the LRP.
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Figure 7: Mediation Sources in Randy’s LRP

Within the sociocultural framework of semiotic mediation put forth by (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), Figure 7 posits that various semiotic resources in the form of instructional feedback and material artifacts, such as the response papers and the MRP, seemed to provided the necessary mediational mechanisms in Randy’s learning environment. By participating in conferences with the instructor to receive feedback, Randy actively constructed agency and engaged with these resources in his social context to negotiate elements of source-based writing.

While academic discursive practices can be fraught with tacit and cultural knowledge, most novice writers are “simply unfamiliar with local expectations” (Hyland,
2002 p.60), and learning them requires exposure and practice which can be slow-paced (Zamel, 1998). In Randy’s situation, as a novice multilingual writer, he seemed to use “rhetorical flexibility to adapt his writing …to ever changing contexts” (Johns, 2008 p.238). Moreover, by regulating his learning and adopting an agentive approach, he accessed the various semiotic resources available in his social context and assumed greater responsibility in the writing task. “Development within this context is the internalization of the mediation that is dialogically negotiated between the learner and others that results in enhanced self-regulation” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.211).

Summary of Randy’s Case

This study introduced students to a combination of literary and nonliterary texts as source texts and examined how multilingual writers navigate the complex discursive practice of writing from literary and nonliterary sources. A major theme that emerged from the findings was related to Randy’s apparent ease and fluency in integrating evidence from source texts regardless of the type of source texts. Using a qualitative approach to data analysis, this chapter revealed that as a novice multilingual student, Randy was a somewhat adaptive writer who seemed to know how to navigate the various literacy demands that the assignments dictated. It is important to consider the context in which these assignments were completed as it may have an influence on the findings. Randy wrote for the instructor as the audience; hence, his use of the literary text in his assignments may have been based on a need to pass the course. Nonetheless, a summary of the findings show that he seemed to use “rhetorical flexibility” (Johns, 2008) to navigate the different literacy demands of the curriculum and seemed to engage in
socially-mediated actions to facilitate his navigation (Lantolf, 2000). Thus, he was able to
move through the layers of complexity involved in the multifaceted task of writing from
sources. In the next chapter, I will introduce the case of Hyunjin, the third participant in
this study, and provide a detailed description of how she navigated and negotiated
elements of source-based writing.
CHAPTER 6

THE CASE OF HYUNJIN

Introduction

The complexity associated with writing from sources, especially the various elements of the task that go together, is quite demanding for novice academic writers and multilingual students alike; and several researchers have attempted to study this complex academic task of writing using sources (Borg, 2000; Campbell, 1990; Dovey, 2010; Greene, 1991; Kennedy, 1995; Wette, 2010). This study examines how participants navigated the complex academic task of source-based writing using a combination of literary and nonliterary sources. This combination sets it apart from previous studies, which have generally looked at source-based writing using only nonliterary texts. The current chapter will focus on Hyunjin, a novice academic writer from Korea and the data for this chapter come from Hyunjin’s personal journals, written course artifacts such as her response papers, Mini and Long Research papers, her source texts, and interview/tutorial transcripts. Using Vygostky’s (1978) sociocultural theory of mediation as extended by Lantolf (2000), the findings in this study draw on theoretical formulations that highlight the role of the “social” in learning and are influenced by the perspective of language learning as socially-mediated. As explained in Chapter 2, Lantolf’s framework of mediation offers a lens to understand how the semiotic mechanisms such as signs and
tools that are embedded in everyday practices have the potential to mediate learning and enable learners to regulate and control the mediational means afforded in their learning process to guide themselves through a task. Hence, the notion of mediation was central in understanding how multilingual novice writers navigated and negotiated elements of source-based writing by accessing material and symbolic artifacts in their social contexts to make sense of their learning.

In what follows, I provide a detailed description of how Hyunjin navigated the academic discursive practice of writing involving both literary and nonliterary sources. This is done by examining a number of themes and issues which arose in the qualitative analysis of her participation in the writing activities of the 108.01 course.

**Background Information about Hyunjin**

Hyunjin first came from South Korea to the US when she was in elementary school because her father was pursuing an MBA at a Mid-western university; hence, she was enrolled in an elementary school in America for approximately two years. The family returned to South Korea two years later, and Hyunjin completed her middle and junior high school education in Korea. About six years after going back to Korea, Hyunjin returned to America as an exchange student in a senior high school program in Michigan and lived with a host family there. She reported that she experienced a loss of English vocabulary upon returning due to the shifting between the US to Korea, and it took her one month to recover and re-learn English words. As a non-American citizen, she was not allowed to graduate from a public high school and, as a result, switched to a private high school in Michigan in order to graduate from an American high school. Once
she graduated, she enrolled in the university that was the site of this study with a goal of completing her final graduate degree in Business. Spending significant time in two countries gave Hyunjin the chance to become multilingual at a high level: she was literate and fluent in both Korean and English, and was minimally literate in Chinese and Japanese. She explained that because the Korean language is derived from the Chinese language, in order to learn Korean, she had to learn Chinese characters. As for Japanese, it was a compulsory language to learn in middle school, and so she had to learn it in order to graduate. Hyunjin’s schooling experiences in both countries made her academically biliterate which may have helped her negotiate her multilingual identity in both Korean and English, the two primary languages she was fluent in.

At the time of the study, Hyunjin’s major at the university was Mathematics, and during the academic term in which the study took place, she was enrolled in four courses: Computer Science & Engineering 200 (CS & E), Math 254.01, English 108.01 and Geography 120. She was hard-working and was determined to complete all of her assignments on time. Hyunjin focused her attention entirely on her coursework at the university; however, she soon felt overwhelmed and became ill early in the term, causing her to miss several of her classes. In her initial interview, she reported that CS & E was her toughest course that term, and she wanted to do well in that course and hence, she invested plenty of time in it. Having missed several Math classes due to her illness, she decided that it was necessary to drop the Math class and reduce her courses to make her course load more manageable. As for reading and writing in her other courses (beyond the 108.01 course), she stated that most of them involved a minimal to a non-existent
reading and writing load. For example, she explained that her Geography class had few readings and the only writing she did was a weekly lab quiz, which was easy, as she “used paraphrasing to answer her post-lab questions” (Journal # 1, April 11, 2010). Her CS & E course consisted mainly of equations and mathematical problems and there was no writing involved. Hence, the current ESL 108.01 writing course was the only course that required her to complete assigned weekly readings and writing assignments.

In the subsections that follow, I relate relevant information about Hyunjin before moving to descriptions of her actual writing experiences in the 108.01 course. In these subsections, I address areas of experience that were relevant to the interests of the study.

**Academic Literacy Experiences**

As noted earlier, Hyunjin had spent some of her younger years in North America and was therefore immersed in an English-speaking as well as school environment where she developed many of her academic literacy skills. She enjoyed reading literature in both English and Korean (her native language), but found classic literature in English to be truly challenging. Prior to the 108.01 course, she had read more than twenty literary books in English, including books she read in her literature class in high school as well as for her own pleasure. As an avid reader, she believed that reading literature helped to stimulate the imagination; hence, when she read, she immersed herself into a character’s experience to make it meaningful for her. Moreover, she seemed to recognize the relationship between reading and writing and believed that reading in English would help improve her grammar and writing. Considering her prior experiences, Hyunjin seemed to have extensive reading experience in comparison with the other two participants, Jie and
Randy, due to studying literature in an American high school and hence, it can be said that she possessed language knowledge that supported the development of writing abilities. As a novice academic and multilingual writer, similar to Randy, Hyunjin had taken the previous writing course 107.01 offered by the ESL Composition department at the university, which addressed several academic writing skills, such as expressing opinions, organizing discourse, integrating source texts, paraphrasing, summarizing, critical review papers, grammar exercises, reflective writing (107 course syllabus). Accordingly, she brought with her a range of literacy related skills and abilities which possibly, from a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978), may have mediated her navigation of discursive practices at the university.

Hyunjin used her journal to express her deepest anxieties pertaining to writing academically, particularly as a novice writer with limited experience in writing academically at the university. She often reminisced about challenges she had encountered in her prior literacy experiences and expressed concerns about facing similar academic tasks again as a college student. For example, in one of her journal entries, she stated,

When attending high school in Michigan, I had to write research papers for American Literature classes. I had hard time understanding what I had to write. I feel like if I connect it to other magazine articles or newspaper articles, it is not my opinion, but the writer’s. So I never understood what I had to do. And when my teacher told me to use quotations from other sources, and told me not to use block quotation, that gave me a hard time too.

(Journal # 3, April 17, 2010).
Clearly, prior challenges with writing research papers in high school seemed to resurface in Hyunjin’s experiences in the 108.01 course and caused her anxiety in engaging in similar tasks. The analysis of the above quotation reveals that she specifically seemed to encounter a challenge with integrating her voice and perspective into the research paper when writing from sources. Wette (2010, p.159) recognizes the complexity of research-based writing and states that what makes it complicated is that “writers need to integrate citations with their own positions and propositions but also to clearly indicate the boundaries between them in order to communicate an authorial identity.” Hence, because writing from sources entails integrating the writer’s position with that of the source text content, within the context of L2 writing, this may be challenging for novice multilingual writers. In fact, challenges with integrating an authorial voice into writing have been documented in several case studies and narratives examining multilingual student’s encounters with academic writing (Hirvela & Belcher, 2001; Ramanathan & Kaplan, 1996; Hyland, 2000; Shi, 2010; Wette, 2010). Hyunjin’s struggle with integrating her perspective into her writing seems to be part of her developing identity as a novice writer and, at the same time, underscores the situated and complex nature of literacy practices (Lea and Street, 1998) in the academy that students have to grapple with.

Despite having attempted writing research papers in high school, Hyunjin was highly confused about this specific genre. Even though her previous experiences in high school may have provided her with language knowledge that supported better writing abilities (Stanovich & Cunningham, 1993), she was apprehensive about writing the research paper and expressed this concern in several of her journals. In one of her
journals, she expressed concern about the Mini Research Paper (MRP) stating, “I think up to this point, writing this MR is okay, but I think that is because I have not started to write the MR yet. But when I start to write the MR, I will definitely face various problems” (Journal # 4, May 1, 2010). In another entry, she wrote “even though this is my third time writing a research paper, I think I still face the same problem that I had before. I got good grades on my research paper in high school, but I never knew why I got the grade.” (Journal # 3, April 17, 2010). Based on the above journal entries, it seems like Hyunjin found the genre of writing from sources to be quite confusing, and her previous academic writing experience of attempting this genre seemed to be unhelpful. This is especially intriguing in view of the fact her high school grade was a good one and that she was unclear as to what she had done well to receive that grade. This suggests that she had learned very little, at most, about source-based writing at that point. The net result is that her high school writing experience failed to provide the scaffolding for college level writing that high school writing tasks are often intended to supply. Whether this was due to limitations in the tasks themselves, especially the high school research paper writing, or an inability on Hyunjin’s part to transfer this prior learning to her source-based writing in the 108.01 course, is not clear. However, recognizing this gap between the prior writing experience and her inadequate attempts to engage the MRP assignment is an important component in analyzing Hyunjin’s efforts to perform source-based writing during the 108.01 course.
In the following section, I elaborate on Hyunjin’s reading experiences of source texts, as understanding how she read will help us make better sense of how she wrote and integrated information from these texts to compose her writing.

Reading Experiences Related to Source-based Writing

Having read more than twenty literary-type books in English, it can be said that Hyunjin was an experienced reader of English compared to the other two participants, Randy and Jie. She found the literary text, Into the Wild, to be an interesting book about adventure, and after reading the introductory chapter, she became curious to find out how the story unfolded. For example, she wrote in her journal “so far the book Into the Wild is an exciting adventurous book that I want to keep reading. I want to know about what is going to happen in the future chapters.”(Journal # 1, April 24, 2010). Similar to Jie, she made personal connections with the main character’s Alaskan adventure and resonated with some of his experiences, as they reminded her of her life away from her parents. For instance, in her journal, she wrote:

When I was reading this book, it reminded me about my Chicago trip last year. Before graduating high school, I wanted to go somewhere all by myself. Since I went to high school in Michigan, it only took about 2 hours to go to Chicago. While I was reading story, I understood all the safety tips from my parents, and how they must have been worried about me on the other side of the earth.

(Journal # 2, April 11, 2010).

Hyunjin engaged with the literary text creatively and connected with it at various levels; at times, she connected personally, while at other times, she objectively criticized the actions of the main character. By often recontextualizing events in the book in her personal domain, Hyunjin creatively shifted contexts from an academic domain to a
personal domain to make sense of the text. She believed that reading helps to create imagination, and throughout her reading of the book, she often immersed herself into the novel, imagining that she shared the experiences of the main character. For instance, in her response paper, she wrote:

Even though I went to Chicago for more than 20 times, I was scared and frightened about where I was and got lost. I cannot imagine how scared Chris McCandless was when he was alone in Alaska. McCandless’ desperate S.O.S note explains how scared, frightened, and hurt he was.

(Response #1, April 11, 2010)

From the above quote, we can see that Hyunjin frequently seemed to identify with McCandless in order to connect with the story. Connecting the events in the story to her personal experiences helped her engage with the text in greater depth, and this may have allowed her to understand the story in a context that was meaningful to her. At other times, similar to Jie, she stepped back from participating in the events depicted in the book and often made judgments about the main character’s actions. For example, in one of her response papers, she stated:

With his braveness, or foolishness, he did not follow the signs of not entering beyond a certain point, or asking for help when his car is broke down. With his young age, it may sound that he is experiencing his time of life, but when looking at this incident in the safety value, he made an unwise decision that sounds ridiculous.

(Response #2, April 19, 2010)

In another response, she disagreed with the actions of the main character. For example, she stated:

Though I am interested to read about his long trip to Alaska, I disagree about his inconsecutive attitudes and behaviors towards different people. It
is also an irony how McCandless did not contact his family and friends, but people that he met for couple of months.

(Response # 3, April 26, 2010)

Clearly, from the above response quote, it can be inferred that Hyunjin analyzed the character’s decision-making to be unwise and foolish, and she was not afraid to critique his actions. In a way, her critical analysis of the events in the text and actions of the main character reveal her initial attempts to come to terms with the topic. Thus, how she read the assigned material may have had an impact on how she wrote about it (Hirvela, 2004).

While reading both literary and nonliterary source texts, Hyunjin used several metacognitive strategies (Anderson, 1991) to mediate her understanding of the texts. For example, she interacted with the text by writing comments in the margins and looking up the meanings of unfamiliar words. Thus, like Randy, she used writing to mediate her reading. In her journal, she outlined how she read:

I read Into the Wild before class on Wednesday for about two hours, all at the same time. I thought the story was interesting, so I made comments, or underlined texts that seemed important or interesting to me. I think it took more time to read three chapters because I tried to understand each and every detail in the story, made comments in the margins, and looked up vocabularies that I did not understand.

(Journal # 3, April 17, 2010)

From the above quote, we can see that Hyunjin employed several reader-initiated actions and relied on writing as a mediational mechanism to actively engage with the text by underlining and writing comments in the margins. An analysis of Hyunjin’s responses to Into the Wild novel revealed that she closely interacted with the text and creatively engaged in her reading process. For example, several lines of the text that related to
Christopher McCandless’s character were highlighted in her copy of the novel, e.g., “Chris’s smoldering anger it turns out was fueled by a discovery he’d made two summers earlier” (Krakauer, 1996 p.121) and “my point is that you do not need me or anyone else around to bring this new kind of light in your life. It is simply waiting out there for you to grasp it” (p.57-58). These kinds of underlined and highlighted sentences illustrate Hyunjin’s analytical engagement with the text. Thus, she was able to control her “psychological and social activity” (Lantolf, 2000 p.6) by underlining and highlighting sentences in the text as her mediational means.

Similarly, when Hyunjin read nonliterary source texts, such as newspaper articles and magazines, she followed a similar strategy of engaging interactively with the texts. Her nonliterary source texts also show evidence of highlighted sentences and marginal notes that presented her analysis. Moreover, in some source texts, she identified and highlighted the thesis statement. Interestingly, there was little evidence of words being translated into her first language, Korean, which is known to be a common cognitive strategy among multilingual users of English (Kern, 1994). Nonetheless, while reading both literary and nonliterary source texts, Hyunjin engaged actively with the texts and marked several areas of the text that seemed important to her as a reader. This “set of operations, steps, plans, routines….to facilitate the obtaining, storage, retrieval and use of information” (Wenden & Rubin,1987 p.19) may reveal that Hyunjin creatively engaged in the reading process, which likely helped her overcome any challenge she may have faced in the reading process, and in the framework of reading-writing connections (Hirvela, 2004), paved the way for her to write about her reading. Thus, with the help of
“culturally constructed auxiliary means” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.59), which may be represented by cultural artifacts, such as books, technology, paper etc. and her participation in cultural activities, such as prior schooling in America, Hyunjin was able to mediate the reading and writing activities in the course.

In the sections that follow, themes and issues related to Hyunjin’s academic reading and writing experiences, especially her source-based writing in the 108.01 course, are explored.

“Trying to find the perfect evidence”

Challenge in Source-based Writing

- *This is my first time writing a research paper in the university*” (Journal # 3, April 24, 2010).

- *Finding the right source is the most time taking part of the MR* (Journal # 4, May 1, 2010)

- *I’m not sure which evidence to choose, so I am already lost a little bit* (Journal # 6, May 23, 2010).

In her 1988 article, “Initiating ESL Students into the academic discourse community,” Spack pointed out the importance of writing from sources and highlighted the need for EAP instruction to include assignments, such as research projects, which encourage students to utilize the library and gather data from sources. Through this task, she argued, students could evaluate and synthesize content from a variety of sources and establish a perspective on a given topic (p.44). Due to the rather complex implementation of source-based writing, and within the context of L2 writing, multilingual novice writers have to compose in their second language and draw on a number of skills to make
important decisions which further complicates the process of acquiring academic literacy. Moreover, while these more subtle and sophisticated skills needed in research-based writing may not yet be fully mastered by novice writers (Wette, 2010), they are expected to be familiar with them. In this study, which was conducted in an EAP course, students were introduced to a variety of source texts, namely a literary source text, *Into the Wild*, and other nonliterary source texts and they were expected to compose an argument using multiple sources. In this section, we will see how Hyunjin, a novice academic multilingual writer, encountered a challenge which was mainly discursive and not related to integration and synthesis while navigating the genre of source-based writing.

To revisit the assignment guidelines, and as mentioned in chapter 4, the Mini Research Paper required students to use two sources from the course and two external sources which students had to locate independently. The purpose of including two external sources was to give students an opportunity to research and evaluate sources independently. This also allowed them the opportunity to experience multimodal composing instead of the traditional reliance on print-based sources. The students were instructed on how to locate sources for their paper by attending a library session in week 6 prior to writing the MRP. Hyunjin’s Mini Research Paper was titled “Risk-taking Adventures” and examined why people engaged in risky adventures. Hyunjin composed an outline and began the process of researching well in advance of the deadline for submission of the first draft of the paper. As for finding appropriate sources to support her argument, similar to Jie, Hyunjin found this to be the most time-consuming and
challenging part of writing the paper. As shown in Table 11 below, she used three source texts: One print-based and two electronic sources.

Table 11: Name and Type of Source texts used in the MRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Name of source text</th>
<th>Type of source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini Research Paper</td>
<td>Into the Wild by Jon Krakauer (1996)</td>
<td>Literary text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adventurers change. Danger does not.</td>
<td>E-source - non-literary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The New York Times by Alan Cowell</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaching new heights. Newsweek</td>
<td>E- source - non-literary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Veronica Meyer. (2007)</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hyunjin used the literary text *Into the Wild* and two nonliterary texts, a newspaper article, “Adventurers change. Danger does not,” and a magazine article, “Reaching New Heights.”

While Hyunjin used a combination of sources that included literary and nonliterary sources in her MRP, all three source texts that she used were assigned in the course and not independently located by her. The assignment instructions had dictated the use of only two sources assigned in the course and encouraged students to independently locate two other sources; hence, it may indicate that Hyunjin did not conduct any research outside of the assigned texts. A possible reason that may explain Hyunjin’s lack of independent research may relate to her struggle in searching for and locating appropriate sources to support her argument. She reported that she spent much time looking for the “perfect source.” For example, in one of her journals, she wrote,

For right now, I have written the outline for the MR. I have done some research from the newspaper, but I do not know if it is related to my topic.
So, I am trying to look for evidence that I can use for the research paper. I am planning to use some internet articles, or lines from the movie that we watched in class. I think the most of the time I am trying to find a perfect source that will make my argument stronger. **Finding the right source is the most time taking part of the MR.**

(Journal # 4, May 1, 2010)

As seen above, Hyunjin seemed to express uncertainty about her researching skills and considered it to be the most time-consuming aspect of the assignment. Hyunjin discussed her struggle during her face-to-face conference with the instructor in which she received feedback on her MRP. Below is an example of the interaction between Hyunjin (H) and her instructor (I) in which she mentioned this specific challenge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5:30</th>
<th>I You have a good control over writing but when it comes to choosing your evidence, there might have been a problem. Is that something you are struggling with?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I You are struggling to find evidence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H Like for the third point in my paper, I was like trying to get another article from online to support it. But I didn’t know like an appropriate …like where to get the idea or like where to choose from. So I kind of stopped right there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Do you think you spent enough time searching for sources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H Yah, I spent like a whole weekend over it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Conference with Hyunjin - May 12, 2010)

From the interaction above, it can be seen that Hyunjin seemed to recognize her challenge with identifying the suitability and relevance of sources to her argument. As can be seen in the above interaction, she spent an entire weekend looking for sources, but yet seemed to struggle in the process of source-text location and use. As noted earlier, despite having attended high school in the United States and having worked with research papers previously, Hyunjin appeared to struggle with working with sources. Researching sources is an integral element of source-based writing and involves reading texts.
critically to determine the suitability of information to support an argument. Moreover, writers have to select and transform specific items of content (Kirkland & Saunders, 1991) and this selectivity, like organization, is an aspect of both reading and writing (Spivey, 1990). Especially within the context of L2 writing, this task may be challenging for L2 writers, and their difficulty may stem from a variety of factors such as limited experience of writing from multiple texts (Wette, 2010), lack of confidence in their skills as L2 writers (Leki & Carson, 1997), and reading proficiency (Shi, 2004; Grabe, 2001).

Upon submission of the MRP, Hyunjin reflected on her performance in one of her journal entries and reiterated her challenge with locating evidence to support her paper. For instance, she commented,

> I had difficulties trying to find the perfect evidence for my research paper...I have learned that I should search my evidence more carefully and try to support my thesis paper... When I am writing my long research paper, I would spend more time researching my evidence and connecting to my thesis statement.

(Journal # 5, May 15, 2010)

Upon reflecting on her struggle with finding sources for the MRP, Hyunjin was also planning for her next assignment – the LRP. As discussed earlier, she was unable to transfer whatever she had learned previously about writing to the current university writing course. What cannot be discerned is whether she had little or nothing to transfer from her high school writing experiences, especially the research paper, or whether her problems rested in difficulties with the transfer process.

Hyunjin encountered similar challenges while working on her Long Research Paper (LRP). The LRP required students to use at least four to five resources, and her
LRP argued how the definition of a hero may vary in different contexts. Despite experience in researching sources for the MRP and classroom instruction on how to look for evidence and integrate sources, Hyunjin expressed a lack of confidence in her ability to locate sources. For example, in one of her journal entries, she wrote:

Currently, I don’t know what will happen writing my final research paper. It takes a long time to research, read, organize, and write my final research paper, but I hope I can write better. In this research paper, I am trying to organize my thesis and evidence as clearly as possible. I’m not sure which evidence to choose, so I am already lost a little bit. But I am trying my best.

(Journal # 6, May 23, 2010).

As seen in the above example, while preparing to write the LRP, Hyunjin once again seemed to be uncertain about the choice of evidence to use in her paper. What she did seem to gain from writing the MRP was an awareness that the task of writing a research paper requires both strategic planning in advance and considerable time and effort. Moreover, she appears to have understood the systematic process of using discrete skills involved in writing a research paper, such as researching, reading, organizing and writing, as she mentioned above. However, actual implementation of what she had learned remained a problem, suggesting only a limited amount of scaffolding arising from the MRP. This could be a reflection of Hyunjin’s own limitations with source-based writing, or it could suggest that students like Hyunjin need more time as they transition from one writing task to another: time to process and to integrate into their evolving system of L2 writing the knowledge and skills gained in a previous encounter with writing.
Although Hyunjin received guidance in locating sources from the library session and practiced using sources in her MRP, she reported spending considerable time looking for evidence to support her claims and often struggled with determining the suitability of source texts to her argument in both the MR and LRP. Hyunjin’s experience may then suggest is that even with practice, the genre of writing from multiple sources is difficult to acquire (Hyland, 2000; Dovey, 2010; Spack, 1988; Wette, 2010). This finding may suggest that transfer from being taught how to do something and actually doing it is a complex process with respect to academic literacy. Although, it must be noted that the challenges Hyunjin faced could have been possibly generated by the instructional context itself and hence, this finding is speculative.

To situate Hyunjin’s challenge within the context of the source-based writing task, the following section will address how she navigated the MR and LRP. As will be seen in this section, Hyunjin appeared to have no difficulty integrating and synthesizing information from both literary and nonliterary source texts into her argument even though she struggled with searching for and handling sources. This apparent contradiction will be addressed later in the chapter. In fact, her experiences reveal that she effectively wove in evidence from both types of source texts into both the MRP and LRP.

**Navigation of the Mini Research Paper: Reading Experiences as a Mediation Mechanism**

*I used the novel Into the Wild as one of my reference because I thought it matched with my thesis statement. I think newspaper articles or magazine articles or using the book*
did not have any different effects. To me it was all research sources, so there was no preference to either one (Hyunjin - Journal # 5 May 15, 2010)

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) instruction emphasizes equipping the learner with a more general and broad set of academic skills to support their learning in disciplinary contexts, what Lea and Street (1998) have called autonomous or decontextualized skills. The EAP perspective is that they need to equip students with this more generic brand of academic literacy knowledge and skills as a prelude or stepping stone into more discipline-specific writing that follows, with students then ready to transfer this academic literacy background to the writing (and reading) demands at work in their chosen disciplinary community. The 108.01 course explored in this study introduced students to a combination of literary and nonliterary source texts and a variety of academic genres which Hyunjin had to navigate. As will be seen, she seemingly moved from one assignment to another with little difficulty by accessing cultural artifacts available in her social context to mediate her navigation.

Hyunjin’s MRP argued for why adventurers engage in risky activities. To support her argument, Hyunjin used the literary text Into the Wild and two nonliterary texts, a newspaper article, “Adventurers change. Danger does not,” and a magazine article, “Reaching New Heights” as evidentiary support in her MRP. As for her performance on integrating both types of texts into her argument, Hyunjin seems to have done so efficiently. In both her Mini and Long research paper, she used the literary text Into the Wild as a source text in combination with nonliterary source texts. However, in this section, I will focus on her performance of integrating both types of texts in her MRP.
Hyunjin’s MRP received a grade of B+, and some instructor comments were: *The paper had a good structure, thesis and great topic sentences. Overall it was cohesive; however, APA documentation was incorrectly cited throughout the paper, which was a requirement of the assignment; the paper was well below the word limit* (MRP Feedback-May 13, 2010).

Similar to Jie, Hyunjin used the literary text *Into the Wild* in her MRP to support her argument. Interestingly, she reported in her journal, that if she were given a choice between using the literary text and the nonliterary texts as source texts, she would have no preference for either as, in her opinion, they all constituted research sources. She further added that the newspaper articles or magazine articles or using the book would not have any specific impact on her paper; hence, she did not see value in preferring one over the other (Journal # 5, May 15, 2010). Interestingly, from her previous experiences of writing research papers in high school, Hyunjin appeared to have construed the notion that the type of source texts used would not have an impact on her paper and seemed to be nonaligned towards any source text type. As for using the literary text, *Into the Wild*, to support her argument, Hyunjin believed that the literary text related directly to her thesis and topic and hence she used it as a source. In her journal, she explained the reason for using the literary text as a source text:

> I used the novel Into the Wild as one of my references because I thought it matched with my thesis statement….I think the novel is easier to support your thesis, if your thesis statement includes one of the topics

(Journal # 5, May 15, 2010).
As can be seen, Hyunjin selected a source text that was directly related to her topic.

Although she seemed to have struggled with locating suitable sources, as discussed in the previous section, Hyunjin appeared to effectively extract evidence from the literary source text to support her argument. As will be seen below, she used the literary text *Into the Wild* as a source to support her claim of why people engage in risky activities; she integrated the evidence effectively by making relevant connections to the thesis and providing supporting explanations. An example of this from her MRP is below:

Another reason people engaged with risky adventures is to be entertained. Adventure is the one way to get out of their boring daily life. People want to have an exciting adventure because people feel satiety and de-stress through the extraordinary experiences, which they have never encounter before. For example, in the book, “*Into the Wild*”, Alex McCandless encourages Ron Franz to be more adventurous and get out of boring everyday life (cited in Krakauer, 1996, pp. 57, 58). While McCandless was headed to Alaska, he met Ron Franz. Franz was the only child in his family, and his own son died, which means that he is the last line in his family. Therefore, Franz wanted to adopt McCandless as his son, to continue on his family. To Franz, McCandless was a special person, at the same time Franz was also special to McCandless. Franz is one of the few people that McCandless stayed in contact while he did not send a single letter to his parents. This means that McCandless had a deep trust to Franz. He emphasized how joy of life comes from new experience, thus people should get out of their repetitive life and explore the world where they have never been to. While on these trips, small problems from their everyday lives will not hinder from enjoying dangerous entertainment because challengers will inevitably concentrate on their task otherwise they will truly risk their lives. Adventures make people to get out of their jobs, schools, or reality to experience a better time. (MRP- May 9, 2010)

Hyunjin’s paper argued for why people may engage in risk-taking activities. As seen in the above example, Hyunjin clearly stated her claim and the next few sentences attempt
to discuss the claim prior to introducing evidentiary support. Hyunjin subsequently integrates the literary text by providing detailed contextual information about the evidentiary source. For a novice academic writer, this act of providing contextual information seems to display her good sense of audience awareness, which some researchers consider central to the process of composing (Elbow, 1981; Flower & Hayes, 1980). Interestingly, Hyunjin provided and weaved this contextual information into her text quite seamlessly, which reveals her ease with processing information from the literary source text to support her claims. As seen earlier, she had problems locating source texts and identifying relevant evidence inside them, but once she conquered these problems, she was able to work the sources into her writing.

Her skillful integration of evidence, in which she took into account her reader, may actually relate back to her reading strategy while reading *Into the Wild* and may highlight the important connection between reading and writing, as several researchers already have indicated (Belcher & Hirvela, 2001; Ferris and Hedgecock, 1998; Grabe, 1991; Nelson, 1998; Stotsky, 1983; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). As mentioned previously in the section on “Reading Experiences related to Source-based Writing,” we can see that Hyunjin clearly engaged with the literary text at a deep and personal level, and as a result of her engaging conversations with the text in which she marked several areas in the text that were important to her as a reader, she may have been able to easily retrieve this information to use as supporting evidence, which highlights the interdependent relationship between reading and writing (Grabe, 2001; Spack, 1988). After all, “writing with or from source texts is an act of reading as well as writing, since it
is through reading that the required writing material is appropriated” (Hirvela, 2001, p.109). Hence, it may be inferred that Hyunjin’s writing was probably mediated by her prior reading experiences which allowed her to regulate her performance on the task.

From a sociocultural perspective of mediation, human learning and development are bound up in activity that is purposefully mediated by various tools such as, computers, language and tasks (Wertsch, 1991) and these mediating tools function as instruments that mediate the transformation of basic mental functions into higher mental functions (Vygotsky, 1978).

As mentioned earlier, in her MRP Hyunjin used three sources to support her argument: the literary text *Into the Wild* and two non-literary source texts, a magazine article and a newspaper article. Similar to her performance on the use and integration of the literary text, Hyunjin efficiently integrated the nonliterary texts into her MRP. This instance below is an example of Hyunjin’s integration of a non-literary text, a magazine article from Newsweek to support her argument in her MRP.

Although risk-taking adventures threaten their own lives, people often gain confidence upon accomplishing the task. They also mature mentally and physically. With rapid growth of technologies, large numbers of people are stimulated to challenge themselves to the limit of human possibilities. In these challenges, people risk their lives to be the first, the best, and the world champion in their field. And finally they when arrive at their goal; they start to re-gain self-trust and confidence. For example, Veronika Meyer (2007), in her article “Reaching New Heights”, despite she was diagnosed with aortic valve disease, she overcame her difficulties and reached the summit on Mount Everest (pp. 1, 2). When she reached the top of the world, Meyer re-gained confidence, strength, and fame. Also, she was able to broaden her view of the world through this experience. More they push themselves to the limit, the more they get sense of
achievement, and then it becomes priceless experience of their life time.

(MRP- May 9, 2010)

As seen in the above example, throughout the paragraph, Hyunjin supports her claim that people may engage in risky activities to gain confidence by following a claim-explanation-evidence structure which embeds her integration of the nonliterary source text. As seen before, she provides contextual information for the reader by summarizing the main idea of the source text, which displays her crucial sense of audience awareness. Moreover, to strengthen the cohesiveness of her argument, she connects the evidence back to her claim.

From a sociocultural perspective, just as individuals use technical tools for manipulating their environment, they use psychological tools (such as language) for directing and controlling their physical and mental behavior (Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.8). Due to the fact that higher psychological functions are symbolically mediated, individuals gain and maintain control over these complex mental processes (Lantolf, 2000). As mentioned before, and based on the analysis of the findings, in this specific case, it seems like Hyunjin’s writing of the MRP may have been mediated by her reading experiences. See Figure 8 below:
Figure 8 posits that Hyunjin’s reading experiences (i.e., the 20 or so literary texts she had read in the past) and current reading experiences may have mediated her navigation of the MRP. Though this study did not include any measures of reading ability, comments Hyunjin made about literary reading indicate that she was a highly engaged reader, and this level of engagement with the texts may have generated a foundation from which she could then use them while writing. Hyunjin’s analytical interaction with the source texts during the process of reading, in which she highlighted areas of the text and wrote marginal notes, may have helped her make sense of the text and thus, retrieve information from these texts. Moreover, by textually processing information from both literary and nonliterary source texts, Hyunjin may have learned to critically analyze how meanings are constructed by the author and thus used this critical information to shape her writing. Thus, within the sociocultural framework of semiotic mediation, as an experienced and engaged reader, it can be inferred that with the help of “culturally constructed auxiliary means” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.59), Hyunjin’s writing seems to have been mediated by her preceding reading experiences, which may have functioned as a resource and she was able to take into account the audience perspective in her writing.
Hyunjin’s regulation and control of her mediational means may indicate her sense of agency she afforded to guide herself through the task of writing the MRP.

**Building her own “Textual World of Meaning” in the Long Research Paper**

- “I didn’t feel like I had to re-read all the chapters so I can find my evidence. I knew what I wanted to write about with McCandless, so it didn’t take long to find the sentence in the book” (Hyunjin- Journal # 7, May 30, 2010).

- Since I am the only one who is familiar with Korean topic, I should have written all the little details and opinions (Hyunjin - Journal # 7, May 30, 2010).

Writers often read source texts with purposes that lead them to “different ways of configuring semantic material and different ways of shaping the textual world” (Spivey, 1990, p.267). In Hyunjin’s case, she relied on semiotic resources such as her reading experiences, instructional resources and her home culture to navigate the LRP, and hence from a sociocultural standpoint, she accessed resources available in her social context.

From a sociocultural standpoint of mediation (Vygotsky, 1978), all forms of higher mental activity are mediated by culturally constructed material or symbolic tools. These tools may include language, concepts, belief systems, books etc. (Lantolf, 2000).

Moreover, the learning environment is full of opportunities for an active, participating learner, and “if the learner is active and engaged, she will perceive linguistic affordances and use them for linguistic action” (Van Lier, 2000, p. 253). As Hyunjin moved on to writing her LRP, she seemed to rely on her available social resources to build her own “textual world of meaning” (Beaugrand & Dressler, 1981). As will be seen below, her LRP produced a strongly weaved in both types of source texts effectively to support the points she was making.
The Long Research Paper (LRP) required students to use at least four to five resources. Prior to writing the LRP, in week eight, students received classroom instruction on how to integrate evidence to support their claims and were taught to write paragraphs that used a claim-discussion-evidence-explanation-concluding point structure proposed by Dollahite & Haun (2006). The “effectiveness of integration of sources” in this study was determined by the above structure that was taught. Hyunjin’s LRP argued how the definition of hero may vary in different contexts and used five different sources, which represented a significantly multimodal approach to the assignment. See Table 12 below:

Table 12: Name and Type of Source texts used in the LRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Name of source text</th>
<th>Type of source text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean economy gets its skates on after Olympic medal haul. <em>Reuters</em> by J. Thatcher (2010).</td>
<td>Non-literary text (e-article)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the table above, once again Hyunjin used a combination of literary and nonliterary source texts to support her argument. Her LRP exceeded requirements and received a grade of A. Some summative instructor comments were: *The paper was well-
organized and interesting to read. The argument was well-supported with research.

Great job on making a strong argument! (Feedback on LRP- June 8, 2010). Her paper exceeded requirements for many reasons: the paper presented a strong cohesive structure supported by evidence from various sources which was analyzed, quoted and/or paraphrased and carefully integrated to convince the reader of her argument; the paper was organized with an interesting thesis statement, and had well developed paragraphs with supporting details and topic sentences. In the example below, Hyunjin’s argument questions the relevance of considering the main character McCandless a hero. An excerpt from her LRP integrating the literary text as a source of evidence is presented below:

Even if considering the basic dictionary meaning of hero, situational setting and the person’s behaviors define someone a hero. In the book “Into the wild” by Jon Krakauer (1997), he writes about a true story of a young teenage boy who hitchhikes off to Alaska without informing his parents, but died before he reunites with his family. This boy, Christopher McCandless, had a strong opinion about what he believed in. After his graduation from Emory, he sells all of his possessions and goes off to the wilderness. During his long journey in the west, he made new relations he can trust, experienced something new, and created memories that will last a lifetime. However, when he finally arrived and settled in Alaska, it did not take long to realize that people cannot live alone. McCandless and his family did not have a strong, good relationship, which affected him to not have a good opinion of meeting other people, or making a family for himself. Thus, in the wilderness, he noticed that he felt lonely and wanted to go back to where it is civilized, and finally back to his house. As McCandless realized, happiness only real when shared (cited in Krakauer, 1996, p. 189). With nothing in his hand, he had no idea of where he was, or what date it was, or what to do for help. Eventually, McCandless died of starvation, and left sadness to his close ones of his family, and those who he met on his trip.

Do you consider McCandless as a heroic person? Or do you consider him as mad person who risk his life into the nature?
Concerning his life time pathway, it was act of braveness to throw away all of his belongings and go out to the wilderness. Considering the dictionary definition of a hero, his braveness is perfectly matching the heroic characteristics. On the other hand, considering that he has achieved nothing, he cannot be called as a hero. He was acting stubborn to his family and friends, and realized the true meaning of happiness as well as the aspects after he pushed everyone out of his world because of his beliefs. Other than this, McCandless did nothing to be called as hero. (Long Research Paper – June 6, 2010)

In this instance, Hyunjin’s claim was immediately followed by a systematic integration of the literary source text Into the Wild. Similar to Jie, although Hyunjin’s topic of “situational definitions of hero” was not directly related to the literary text, Hyunjin seemed to have extracted evidence from the text and integrated it into her argument. She provides a contextual summary of the source text to inform the reader about the main idea of the source text and towards the end (in the paragraph that follows), she ties back the evidence to her main claim. Hyunjin’s provision of a contextual summary once again points to her developed sense of audience awareness (Elbow, 1981), and cohesive form of discussion, in which she makes connecting explanations back to her main claim, highlights some of the rhetorical skills she may have learned from writing the MRP.

Moreover, what is interesting in the LRP is that as a multilingual academic writer, Hyunjin’s paper argues for a balanced perspective on the definition of a hero and in doing so, seems to display a strong sense of persuasion and creativity, based on the examples integrated in her paper. For example, in this specific instance above, she questions the relevance of considering the main character as a hero. As for using the literary text Into the Wild, as mentioned earlier, although it was not directly related to Hyunjin’s topic, she
skillfully extracted information from the source text to argue her claim. In her final journal entry, she discusses how this was initially a challenge:

I used Into the Wild as one of my example, and it was kind of hard to relate him to my topic because it was hard to determine if he was a hero, or if he was not a hero. There are many opinions about McCandless, so I had hard time trying to relating him to my topic. I didn’t feel like I had to re-read all the chapters so I can find my evidence. I knew what I wanted to write about with McCandless, so it didn’t take long to find the sentence in the book.

(Journal # 7, May 30, 2010)

As seen in the above example, although Hyunjin seemed to struggle with relating the evidence to her topic, she successfully linked the main character in the text to her claim. Her effective integration may relate back to her engagement with the texts and her extensive reading experience. As mentioned earlier, this reported ease with which she seemed to extract and use evidence from the source text may relate back to her strategic and active engagement with the text while reading and her in-depth textual processing, which likely mediated her writing, thus preparing her to write about her reading. As revealed in the findings stated earlier, her interaction with the source texts reveals that she actively interacted with the texts, which suggests her agentive approach to “constructing the terms and conditions of her own learning.” (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001). As Lantolf and Pavlenko assert, “it is agency that links motivation to action and defines a myriad of paths taken by learners” (pp.145-146).

Hyunjin met with the instructor for one-on-one feedback prior to submitting her LRP, during which she discussed how to integrate the various sources of evidence to support her argument. The tutorial extract below is an example of Hyunjin’s dialogic
interaction discussion with the instructor which addresses the issue of claims and evidence in her LRP. As will be seen below, Hyunjin’s discussion with the instructor seems to make the integration of evidence and claims more coherent and meaningful for her. The discussion below is between the Instructor (I) and Hyunjin (H) and is based on a Long Research Paper draft that she brought in for feedback. An excerpt from this individual conference is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>Going back to your use of McCandless’ example here, you are talking about his bravery, right? Are you arguing that he was a hero because he was brave? Can you clarify?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Well he was brave but most people think he was kind of crazy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Why would you say he was brave?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Because even if he was young he went to Alaska and other places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>So what did he do there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:50</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>He didn’t really achieve anything so I am saying that his bravery is good but since he didn’t achieve anything people cannot call him hero. He lost his life and tried to live on his own but he found out he couldn’t live alone away from society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ok so you want to argue that McCandless should not be called a hero, is that right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ok. Did you explain that clearly to the reader in your draft?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I don’t think so but that is what I want to say in my paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>That’s right. I don’t see that mentioned in your paper. You need to clarify that for your reader. You need to have strong clear argument for your claims to explain how some people may consider him a hero and some may not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the instance above, Hyunjin has dialogic interaction with the instructor where she discusses why McCandless should not be called a hero. While the draft of her paper did not clearly identify the direction of her argument, the face-to-face conference seemed
to provide Hyunjin with an opportunity to talk about her writing and discuss how she
planned to argue her claim. As seen above, by engaging in a discussion with the
instructor about why she thought McCandless should not be called a hero, Hyunjin
seemed to establish the clarity of her claim. The example of this discussion as
implemented in her paper is presented below:

Do you consider McCandless as a heroic person? Or do you
consider him as mad person who risk his life into the nature?
Concerning his life time pathway, it was act of braveness to
throw away all of his belongings and go out to the wilderness.
Considering the dictionary definition of a hero, his braveness is
perfectly matching the heroic characteristics. On the other hand,
considering that he has achieved nothing, he cannot be called as a
hero. He was acting stubborn to his family and friends, and
realized the true meaning of happiness as well as the aspects after
he pushed everyone out of his world because of his beliefs. Other
than this, McCandless did nothing to be called as hero.

Within the framework of mediation theory (Lantolf, 2000), it can be inferred that a
dialogic model of conferencing with the instructor seemed to mediate Hyunjin’s
understanding of the task and enhance clarity. Thus, through this interaction with the
teacher, Hyunjin was able to extend her understanding of how to frame her argument for
the reader in a clear manner and use this feedback constructively in her paper. “Social
interaction actually produces new, elaborate, and advanced psychological processes that
are unavailable to the organism working in isolation” (Vygotsky, 1989 p. 61). This kind
of teacher-led scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978; Patthey-Chavez and Ferris, 1997) has been
noted as a form of “scaffolding” for second language writers, which prompts them to
revise their texts (Ewert, 2009). Also, as noted in second language research, in order for
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any type of scaffolding to be effective, it needs to be “sensitive to the learner’s level of help required” and needs to be dialogic (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994 p.468). Additionally, as Lantolf and Appel (1994) point out, “it is not the successful completion of task that is of importance, but “the higher cognitive process that emerges as a result of the interaction” (p.10).

As for integrating the nonliterary source texts into her LRP to support her claims, Hyunjin displayed similar skills of effective integration and persuasion. In the following example below, she utilizes a non-literary text to show how the definition of hero changes across cultures. Taken from her LRP, the example is presented below:

On March 26th, 2010, a Navy battleship was attacked and 46 soldiers died at sea around Cheonan, South Korea. Among 46 losses, there were soldiers as young as 18 years old or heads of families. In “South Korea mourns victims of warship sinking”, Choe (2010), mentions about how when this incident occurred, the government did not mention any remarks that will give warnings to North Korea, even if this could be the most serious attack since the Korean War. Although these soldiers died while they were on the duty, because of Korea’s abnormal culture of sympathy and disagreement towards current government, people did not want to accept the reason for their loss. Cultural differences of countries made these 46 soldiers as heroes. Choe also states that these 46 soldiers were honored with military medals that are usually reserved for combat deaths (The New York Times, 2010, para. 5). It is agreeable to be sad and disappointed about the government, but it is disagreeable to award the highest medals to these soldiers. Strangely, there are countless soldiers who fought in the Korean War in 1950’s, and did not receive any medals of honor.

The 46 soldiers should be honored because they are innocent soldiers who were on duty, but even with many combat soldiers who did not get any honor, it is unnecessary for their achievement to get the highest medal. With growing anti-government movement, 46 dead soldiers were able to become heroes and awarded with the highest honor as a soldier. This
example clearly shows that different situations can have an influence on how the public decide who can be called as heroes. Both McCandless and 46 soldiers died with braveness, it is different how people address these brave men as heroes or not.

As seen in the above example, in her claim of how the definition of hero varies, Hyunjin provides a thorough discussion by using the example of the victims of a warship sinking in Korea. Although the topic sentence is missing in this example, Hyunjin effectively extracts evidence from the newspaper article, summarizes it for the reader, and integrates it by efficiently providing connecting explanations to support her claim. Interestingly, Hyunjin relied on her Korean background and selected examples from her native Korean culture and from non-literary texts which could be seen as a creative approach to negotiate elements of source-based writing. Hyunjin brought aspects of her personal culture to the academic task, thus making it a meaningful experience for her. Within the context of L2 writing and from the perspective of Lantolf’s mediation theory, Hyunjin’s integration of a culture-specific example to support her argument reveals some insight into the kind of dismantling and reconfiguring multilingual students engage in as writers. In this specific situation, it may suggest that Hyunjin used her cultural background as a mediating mechanism to navigate the LRP.

From a sociocultural perspective of mediation, cultural artifacts embedded in everyday literacy practices (Wertsch, 1985) have the potential to socially mediate the learning process. Figure 9 below attempts to capture the effects arising from the multiple sources that mediated Hyunjin’s navigation:
Figure 9 posits that Hyunjin interacted with instructional and cultural resources in her social context to mediate her navigation of source-based writing. Her previous and current reading experiences at the university seemed to have mediated her understanding of audience awareness in writing (Elbow, 1981; Flower & Hayes, 1980) and through those experiences, she learned some significant lessons in source-based writing, such as the importance of strategic and advance planning while composing from sources.

Additionally, by adopting an agentive approach in her learning, Hyunjin regulated the mediational means in her social context by accessing instructional and cultural resources in her learning environment to navigate the LRP. In explaining Vygotsky’s (1978) mediation theory, Lantolf and Thorne (2006) posit that higher forms of human mental activity are mediated by artifacts; specifically, “auxiliary means arise from participation in cultural activities …in which cultural artifacts such as books, technology, paper etc. and cultural concepts such as self, person, literacy, mind etc. interact in complex dynamic ways with each other and with psychological phenomena” to
give rise to higher mental functions (memory, learning and development) which allows individuals to voluntarily and intentionally gain control (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.59).

As a novice academic multilingual writer, Hyunjin seemed to have made use of all these available resources and used them as a mediating tool to negotiate complex elements of source-based writing.

Completing a multifaceted task such as writing from sources can be demanding on multilingual writers, and Hyunjin’s experience sheds light on how this group of writers navigates complex academic assignments such as writing a research paper. By using her personal domain such as her home culture as a mediating tool to navigate writing from sources, Hyunjin creatively linked her existing knowledge of her cultural background with the academic literacy practice she engaged in to facilitate her negotiation of source-based writing.

**Summary of Hyunjin’s Case**

The main purpose of this study was to investigate how novice academic writers navigated source-based writing with a specific focus on their response to literary and non-literary source texts. From a sociocultural perspective of mediation (Lantolf, 2000), this chapter revealed that as a multilingual academic writer, Hyunjin constructed agency and accessed instructional and cultural resources to in her social context to mediate her navigation of both the MRP and LRP. While she encountered a challenge in researching and selecting sources, she seemed to fluently integrate evidence from source texts regardless of the type of source texts. Nonetheless, it must be noted that Hyunjin’s challenges may have been generated by the instructional context itself. Moreover,
although Hyunjin used the literary text in both of her assignments, it is important to consider that using the literary text was an expectation of the course; hence, the specific context of the study may have had an influence on the choice of source texts used. The following chapter 7 will present a cross-case analysis of all three case study participants and discuss the findings in relation to scholarly literature in the field of second language literacy and the theoretical framework used in this study.
CHAPTER 7
DISCUSSION / CONCLUSION

Introduction

Within higher education settings, and in particular, within a U.S. university, multilingual students entering university are often expected to be equipped with literacy practices that are already an established part of academic discourse and which include the knowledge of linguistic, social and cultural features of academic discourse used by specific academic disciplines (Lea, 1998). An important and complex stage of learning the specific discursive practice of academic literacy involves the ability to synthesize information through a skillful integration of various sources. One of the most common writing tasks that undergraduate students at the university encounter involves research-based writing in which the writer must incorporate, through various available means (e.g., summarizing, paraphrasing, direct quotation), material from external sources into their own writing. To do so, students must perform various operations that involve both reading and writing, such as locating appropriate source texts, identifying and analyzing relevant information within the sources, and extracting and relocating (in their own texts) such information in ways that are considered acceptable within the conventions of academic writing. To account for this need, and recognizing that international students may not yet have acquired this kind of knowledge, many Anglophone universities offer
writing courses for second language (L2) writers like the one that served as the research site for this study.

Novice academic writers typically struggle with this form of ‘appropriating and representing social discourses’ (Bakhtin, 1986), not only due to cultural differences, but also perhaps due to the fact that many of them may not know the purpose of a source text and how to use it effectively, such as in developing evidence used to support claims made in argumentative essays. Students entering the university are expected to be prepared to grapple with the challenges of academic life and manage “confrontation with the complex linguistic and rhetorical expectations of the academy” (Rose, 1985 p.357). For those new not only to the academy but also to the culture in which it exists, such as international students studying in Anglophone universities, this can constitute a particularly daunting set of challenges. In this context, it is necessary for educators and policy makers to become aware of specific challenges novice multilingual writers grapple with while learning complex academic discursive practices in their first year at the university, when it is especially important to establish a foundation in academic literacy practices that can be drawn from and extended in the remaining years of study. As L2 writing specialists have developed courses and approaches to writing instruction geared toward helping L2 writers acquire the academic literacy skills they require, some have advocated for the inclusion of literary texts in the teaching of source-based writing in the belief that exposure to such texts would be both fulfilling and valuable for novice L2 writers (Hirvela, 2004). This call for the inclusion of literature has generally been rejected on the grounds that such texts are too difficult for novice L2 writers to understand, and that
literary texts are not commonly used as source texts for academic writing purposes (see Hirvela, 1990, 2001, 2004; Hirvela & Belcher, 2000 for reviews of the debate over the use of literature in academic writing instruction).

Because the ability to use sources effectively is considered to be a fundamental element of writing in Anglophone universities, many researchers in both L1 (native language) and L2 (second language) contexts have examined students’ engagement with source-based writing. Within this large body of research, quite a few studies have provided evidence to show that international students struggle with reorganizing data from multiple sources in ways that are appropriate to the assigned task (Johns, 1985b, 1986; Swales, 1982). Past studies have also explored how second language writers use source texts to compose their own arguments and have tended to focus on issues of plagiarism (Bloch, 2000; Currie, 1998; Howard, 1999; Pecorari, 2001); as well as paraphrasing and summarizing (Abasi & Akhbari, 2006; Campbell, 1990; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Keck, 2006; Shi, 2006). For the most part, this research has examined students’ use of one broad category of sources: nonliterary texts. The subject of how multilingual writers may respond to a combination of literary and nonliterary source texts in has remained largely unexplored, and yet students may well wish to use both types of sources in certain writing situations. The absence of such research is especially notable in the context of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) writing courses that international students are often required to take in their first year of university study so as to begin equipping them to meet the academic literacy demands found in other courses. Because of the core mission of such courses to instill in students a foundation of core academic
literacy skills, it is important to explore how students learn to work with a variety of source texts (literary and nonliterary). However, it appears, anecdotally speaking, that this combination of source types is not common in EAP courses, despite the importance of providing students with maximum exposure to the use of source texts. As noted earlier, there has generally been a belief among EAP specialists that literary texts are not relevant or useful. Typically, EAP courses rely only on nonliterary texts, because they are believed to be the more commonly utilized sources in other courses across the academy. As a result, research on source-based writing in EAP courses has almost always focused on nonliterary source text use.

Within this aforementioned educational context, this specific study took place in an EAP writing course for undergraduate students which used a combination of literary and nonliterary source texts to teach novice multilingual students about research-based writing. Hence, the study focused on how novice multilingual academic writers negotiated the specific academic discursive practice of literary and nonliterary research-based writing within this combination of literary and nonliterary sources. In doing so, the overarching goal of this study was to explore the use of literature within the context of teaching research-based writing in an EAP course, since so little research has focuses on literary texts. The purpose of the study was to further our understanding of the complicated processes involved in learning the practice of writing from multiple sources, literary and nonliterary, while at the same time, from the perspective of educators and researchers, contributing to the larger context of EAP writing instruction by widening the lens in which such instruction can take place.
Hence, the broad overarching question that my study addressed was:

- In a course like English for Academic purposes (EAP) which focused on source-based writing, what is the place of literature to teach research-based writing?

Using a qualitative case study method, that included an ethnographic approach to textual analysis, I investigated how three first-year multilingual academic writers negotiated elements of source-based writing by looking in particular at how they performed on writing tasks that involved the use of both literary and nonliterary sources.

The two main research questions that I addressed were:

- How did undergraduate multilingual writers in an EAP course navigate the academic discursive practice of synthesizing texts and integrating both literary and nonliterary texts as source texts into the composition of their research-based writing assignments?

- How did undergraduate multilingual writers respond to literary texts as source texts? To what extent, and how effectively, did they use literary texts as sources compared to nonliterary, information-based source texts?

With this in mind, this final chapter will first present a combined summary and discussion of the main findings while addressing the study’s two more focused research questions. In doing so, it locates the findings within the broader field of second language literacy studies. It then addresses the larger question of the place of literature in an EAP course to teach source-based writing. This is followed by a discussion of pedagogical implications arising from my findings and recommendations for future research.
Summary and Discussion of the Findings

In this study, I used a text-oriented ethnographic approach which relied on student interviews, a thick description (Geertz, 2007) of context, and fine-grained analysis of students’ essays/texts to understand how the participants negotiated their way into academic discursive practices of using sources to compose their own text. This approach included elements such as participant observation, interviewing, and detailed contextual analysis with an analysis of students’ texts to construct a better understanding of the writer’s construction of the text (Swales & Leubs, 1995). The main purpose of using this methodology was to capture the “contextualization and situatedness” (Swales, 1998a) of written texts that were composed by multilingual novice writers through the use of multiple source texts. Therefore, I was able to go beyond the text into the social and cultural context surrounding the broad topic of research writing, thus allowing for an ethnographic analysis of contexts in which the text was produced, as well as factoring in the participants’ views on text production.

The findings in this study drew on theoretical formulations that highlight the role of the “social” in learning and are influenced by the perspective of language learning as socially mediated (Vygotsky, 1978). As explained in Chapter 2, Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory of mediation as extended by Lantolf (2000) was used in this study because it casts learning as a fundamentally social and cultural activity that is mediated by semiotic mechanisms such as signs and tools that are embedded in everyday practices. These semiotic (psychological tools) and physical tools are artifacts created by humans and have the potential to mediate human development and learning. Just as individuals use
technical tools for manipulating their environment, they use psychological tools for directing and controlling their physical and mental behavior (Lantolf & Appel, 1994 p.8). Therefore, the sociocultural perspective is a lens through which learning can be seen as a developmental process mediated by semiotic resources. This framework was used in this study because it allows us to understand that cultural artifacts that mediate learning may be not only social but also material (texts, practices, artifacts).

In relation to the study’s research questions, the meanings of the findings are situated within the larger framework of second language literacy studies and are presented with four main themes that emerged:

1. The experience of learning how to write with a combination of literary and non-literary sources varied for each participant and was based on their academic literacy experiences and their interaction with resources in their social context.

2. There seemed to be apparent fluency and ease of integrating evidence from source texts across all participants, regardless of the type of source texts.

3. Some discursive challenges while writing research-based assignments were encountered; however, there seemed to be no noticeable difference or struggle in specifically using either literary or non-literary source texts.

4. A grounded theoretical hypothesis that emerged from this study was related to the contribution of literary texts in promoting student’s creativity in their composition.
The first research question the study investigated was:

- How did undergraduate multilingual writers in an EAP course navigate the academic discursive practice of synthesizing texts and integrating both literary and nonliterary texts as source texts into the composition of their research-based writing assignments?

The primary findings of this study revealed that all of the participants brought a varied range of personal literacy experiences to the academic discursive practice of integrating literary and nonliterary source texts, which may have impacted how they wrote from multiple texts. For instance, Hyunjin seemed to have extensive reading experience in English due to her high school education in America, through which she had read more than twenty literary texts in English; on the other hand, Jie and Randy had limited experiences in reading literature in English and had read no more than four literary books at the time of the study. These experiences may have mediated how they accessed and used both literary and nonliterary source texts in their writing in the 108.01 course. Their writing experiences varied as well; Hyunjin and Randy had previous academic literacy experiences at the university level from taking the previous writing course (107.01) in the ESL composition department where they were exposed to academic reading activities and basic academic writing skills such as expressing opinions, writing critical reviews, and techniques related to source text use, such as paraphrasing, while Jie was new to academic writing at the university. Hence, how they used their academic literacy experiences may have mediated their navigation of current discursive practices at the university (Koda, 2007). In other words, their experiences with
academic literacy may have acted as a repository of knowledge, skills and abilities that they drew from when learning literacy in a new language (Riches & Genesee, 2006), as “prior literacy experiences foster an explicit understanding of what is to be accomplished in the task, and this in turn, may expedite the process by allowing learners to be more reflective and strategic” (Koda, 2007, p. 74).

Moreover, how the participants read the assigned material may have had an impact on how they wrote about it (Hirvela, 2004), which highlights the interdependent relationship between reading and writing processes (Spack, 1988). Several researchers have investigated the possible relations between reading and writing (Grabe, 1991; Stotsky, 1983; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). In fact, many scholars have documented the complex link between reading and writing abilities and the “extent to which reading can be, and in academic settings nearly always, is the basis for writing” (Carson and Leki, 1993 p.1). In my study, all three participants read and engaged with both the literary and nonliterary source texts at different levels. While Randy interacted with the source texts by highlighting parts of the text writing marginal notations, Jie and Hyunjin engaged and connected personally with the literary text by writing reflective comments and analyzing it in depth, which may have helped them overcome any challenge they might have faced in the reading process. Thus, the participant’s in-depth textual processing and analysis resulting from their engagement with the texts may have impacted how they wrote about the text. Hirvela (2004, p. 109) aptly points out this reading-writing connection by stating that “writing with or from a source text is an act of reading as well as writing, since it is through reading that the required writing material is appropriated.”
A significant finding in my study pertains to the experience of learning to write from multiple sources. Consistent with findings in several source-based writing studies (Dovey, 2010; McCulloch, 2012; McCune, 2004; Wette, 2010), two out three participants in this study encountered challenges with specific aspects of research-based writing, thus indicating the complex nature of this domain of academic literacy. Most previous studies on source-based writing found that L2 writers specifically struggled with understanding the role of evidence in their essays (McCune, 2004) or with integrating sources into their text (Dovey, 2010; McCune, 2004); relied heavily on direct quotations (Borg, 2000; Campbell, 1990); used source texts inappropriately (Howard, 1995; Pecorari, 2010); or lacked an authorial stance and attributed authority to sources (McCulloch, 2012; Pecorari, 2003; Petric, 2007). Two participants in this study did encounter a few challenges while navigating the genre of research-based writing, but these challenges were mainly related to discursive components of the genre and varied across all participants. For instance, Jie seemed to struggle with the process of researching (Petric, 2012; Wette, 2010), with the concept of common knowledge (Chandrasoma et al., 2004; McCulloch, 2012; Shi, 2004; Thompson, 2005), and organizational issues, while Hyunjin struggled with identifying the suitability and relevance of sources to her argument (Petric, 2012; Wette, 2010).

While these challenges may not be unique to L2 writers, they nonetheless represent difficulties associated with the various discursive components of research-based writing.

Within an L2 context, while writing research papers is a multifaceted task novice multilingual students have to grapple with; this sophisticated task requires writers to combine various skills of argumentation, evaluation of sources, citation practices, and
source integration, which is rather complex in its implementation. Specifically, L2 writers may have linguistic difficulties that may affect their language use and reading abilities in addition to cultural barriers that may impede their interpretation of the texts they read or write (Spack, 1998, p. 97). Thus, their linguistic and cultural challenge can add up to a significant degree of difficulty making the discourse components of the task even more complex for them. Moreover, the process of acquiring these skills is “slow-paced and continues to evolve with exposure, immersion and involvement” (Zamel, 1998, p. 260). Bazerman (1980) reminds us that an intelligent approach to reading begins with not only a precise understanding of the text that may include facts and ideas, but also the purpose of the author, which emphasizes the importance of critical reading. Spack (1988) highlights the complexity of reading in a second language and reminds us that understanding an author’s purpose in a text and understanding the text accurately is not easy for second language readers. Additionally, several L2 writing researchers (Hyland, 2000; Pecorari, 2006; Shi, 2010) have already pointed out that “the relationship between the writer of an academic text and the sources cited in the text is not entirely straightforward” (cited in Wette, 2010, p.159), as it entails a complex skill set, and the challenges associated with poor source use are multidimensional (McCulloch, 2012, p. 66). Clearly, academic discursive practices can be fraught with tacit and cultural knowledge, and most novice L2 writers are “simply unfamiliar with local expectations” (Hyland, 2002, p. 60). Moreover, it is important to note that these challenges experienced by the participants in the study might have been generated by the instructional context in which the texts were produced; hence, the findings may be speculative.
Interestingly, despite the many challenges documented in the aforementioned studies of multilingual writer’s use of source texts, the findings in this study seemed to reveal that when it came to integrating and synthesizing both literary and nonliterary source texts into their writing, the participants navigated the complex discursive practice in their own individual ways, and with some effectiveness. For example, although Jie encountered challenges while writing from sources, she seemed to experience a number of successes as well. By using scaffolded mechanisms and available resources in her social context, she mediated her navigation of both the assignments as reported in Chapter 4. Randy, on the other hand, seemed to be an adaptive writer who took an agentive approach in his writing and found ways to mediate himself and his relationship to the task as seen in chapter 5. Likewise, Hyunjin’s navigation of literary and nonliterary source-based writing seemed to be mediated by her previous literacy experiences and her agentive approach to using social and cultural artifacts available in her social context. Notably, the experiences of the participants in this study revealed that, with respect to the task of writing from multiple sources, they seemed to have met the expectations of the course “successfully ferreting out their own paths toward the completion of their work” (Leki, 1990, p. 255). The individually nuanced ways in which they successfully incorporated source text material into their own writing adds to the L2 writing field’s understanding of how novice L2 writers mediate the demands of research-based writing.

While the findings in the study suggest that the participants appeared to have no significant difficulty in synthesizing and integrating information from literary and
nonliterary source texts, it is important to note that scaffolded mechanisms and semiotic resources in their social context might have mediated the participant’s navigation of source-based writing. Supportive behaviors adopted by the instructor “in collaboration with the L2 learner that might facilitate the learner’s progress to a higher level of language development” (Guerrero & Villamil, 2000, p. 53) functioned as a mediational mechanism in the learning process. Hence, when learners interact with mediating semiotic resources, it is not the successful completion of the task that is of importance, but “the higher cognitive process that emerges as a result of the interaction” (Appel & Lantolf, 1994, p.10) in the ZPD. Additional scaffolded mechanisms in the form of the outline templates, breaking down of the complex elements of the task, individual instructor-student conferences, and semiotic resources available in their social context (Vygotsky, 1978) might have functioned as mediational means that contributed to their negotiating elements of source-based writing. For example, material artifacts such as the writing of response papers and symbolic tools such as dialogic conferences with the instructor seemed to have mediated Jie’s understanding of writing literature-based assignment such as the Mini and Long Research Paper. Hyunjin and Randy, on the other hand, “constructed the terms and conditions of their own learning” (Lantolf & Pavlenko, 2001 pp.145-146) by taking an agentive approach and in doing so, found new ways to mediate themselves and their relationships. Thus all three participants “deployed cultural constructed artifacts, concepts and activities to regulate and transform their material world” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006 p.79) that eventually allowed them to gain voluntary control over the task. Thus, the findings in this study underscore the usefulness of
scaffolded mechanisms available in the social context to mediate the complex elements of source-based writing.

The second question this research examined was:

- How did undergraduate multilingual writers respond to literary texts as source texts? To what extent, and how effectively, did they use literary texts as sources compared to nonliterary, information-based source texts?

An analysis of the participant’s response to the literary text as a source text, *Into the Wild*, revealed some interesting perceptions that varied across all participants. As stated earlier, all participants had engaged in reading both literary and nonliterary in English prior to the study; as a result, they brought their individual experiences to the process of reading (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Koda, 2007). While all of the participants seemed to enjoy reading the literary text, their attitudes towards using it as a source text revealed varying responses. As a passionate reader of the text, Jie was eager to dig deeper into the story and took every opportunity in her journal and response papers to express her love for the text and her admiration for the main character in the text. Similar to Jie, Hyunjin reported a personal connection with the story, and often immersed herself into the experiences and events of the text. Due to extensive reading experience, she reported finding the text easy to read and was able to extract evidence easily from it. Unfamiliar vocabulary did not discourage both Jie and Hyunjin from reading the text, and they connected with it at a deep, personal level and interpreted the events in a context that was meaningful for them (Anderson & Pearson, 1985; Grabe, 1991; Hirvela, 2004).
From a transactional view of literacy and within the framework of reading-writing connection, the role of the reader is highlighted, and hence the reader’s individuality and what they bring to the text is considered to be crucial (Hirvela, 2004; Rosenblatt, 1978) which may have impacted how they accessed and used it as a source text. As for Randy, although he did not seem to be overly passionate about reading the literary text, he described it to be an “interesting and a must-read book.” Randy found the text quite easy to read and acknowledged its value in a writing class. His connection with the text was more functional, in the sense that he considered it to be strictly a source text, unlike Jie, whose connection with the literary text seemed to be more emotional and personal. Thus, the findings seem to reveal that each participant in this study had a unique relationship with the literary source text, which likely impacted how they accessed and extracted information to use it as a source text. Also important here, especially with respect to the debate over the use of literary texts in EAP instruction, is that, for two of the participants, the literary text engaged them in ways the nonliterary texts seemingly did not. This speaks to the power and appeal of literature that its advocates for use in EAP writing courses have noted. Source-based writing is not simply a mechanical matter of finding suitable material in source texts and relocating it in one’s own writing. In courses teaching the skills of source-based writing, as EAP courses do, there is also the hope that students transfer what they have learned to other contexts where source-based writing is required. More meaningful personal connections with the sources in an EAP course may enhance those transfer possibilities, and they equip students with the ability to draw from a larger repertoire of possible sources, thus leaving them better prepared for future
source-based writing experiences. Thus, there seems to be a viable role for literary texts in EAP writing courses, as will be discussed later.

As for their response to the nonliterary texts, the analysis found that the participants had a generally nonaligned attitude towards using nonliterary texts as source texts. As seen in chapters 4, 5, and 6, nonliterary texts constituted magazine articles, newspaper articles, and website sources. All three participants reported no difficulty in using nonliterary texts as sources and used them to support their argument in the MR and LRP. Interestingly, the analysis found that while Hyunjin and Jie did not necessarily connect personally with nonliterary texts, they seemed to be actively engaged in the analysis of them and indicated their responses to them. For example, in responding to a newspaper article, Hyunjin wrote “The article “Adventurers Change?” was disappointing, but I do feel that is the reality when it comes to climbing a mountain. When people are in a bad, harsh condition and their bodies feel un-normal because of the height, I think all they think about is themselves” (Journal #1, April 24, 2010). In responding to the similar article, Jie wrote “it seems to be very cruel that the mountaineers left David Sharpe who was ….under overhang below the peak and let the 36-year-old climber wait for the coming of death” (Marginal note- “Adventurers change” article). In making judgments about the text, Jie and Hyunjin appeared to analyze nonliterary texts, and writing is the means through which these analyses take shape (Hirvela, 2001). Similar to his perspective toward literary source texts, Randy seemed to view nonliterary source texts from a purely functional standpoint of constituting sources and did not have a personal response to either text type. In general, the participants appeared to relate to nonliterary
texts in a functional manner and not emotionally and personally as Jie and Hyunjin did with the literary text.

In considering how the participants responded to using both literary and nonliterary source texts, the study found that the general attitude of the participants was not inclined towards any specific text type. For example, Hyunjin indicated that she lacked preference for any specific type of source text; similarly, Jie showed no explicit preference for either source text type. Even though Randy did not specifically use the literary text, *Into the Wild*, in his Mini Research Paper, he did use a chapter from another literary source text. Hence, it cannot be stated that Randy showed a preference for nonliterary texts. Randy did, however, specify that as a nonnative speaker of English, he preferred source texts with a shorter length and that related to his specific topic of research. Similarly, Hyunjin and Jie both preferred source texts that matched their respective research topics. Hence, while all three participants indicated no specific preference for either literary or nonliterary source texts type, their choice of source text was presumably related to the academic task at hand (Greene, 1991), and did not in any way indicate their general attitude toward a particular text type.

Table 13 is a compilation of how often the participants in this study used material from source texts to support their argument. The numbers in the table represent the frequency count of the participants’ use of literary and non-literary material cited in the Mini and Long Research papers. Because citation of sources is a crucial feature of analyzing academic texts (Hyland, 2000), the frequency count was used to analyze the number of times the participants borrowed information from source texts, and the data
was taken from the final draft of their MRP and LRP. Due to the subjective nature of human coding and categorizing (Harwood, 2004) in citations, any reference to a source text was counted, and this included both paraphrased and quoted material. For example, integral citations that used part of the noun-phrase structure in subject position, such as “according to” (Hyland, 1999 p.347), were counted as one citation. If the same source was cited twice in the same paragraph due to incorrect citation placement or over-citing, then it was counted as being cited once. For example, in some situations, the participants cited the source at the start of the sentence and again at the end of the sentence. In this case, it was counted as having been cited only once. Specifically, in the case of citing the literary text *Into the Wild*, the participants used various examples from the text to support their argument. In this instance, each time a specific example from the literary text was used to support a different point and was cited, it was counted as one citation.
Table 13: Frequency Counts of Literary and Non-literary Material Cited in the Mini and Long Research Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jie</th>
<th>Randy</th>
<th>Hyunjin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini Research Paper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation of Literary material (Into the Wild)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation of non-literary material</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Research Paper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation of Literary material (Into the Wild)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation of non-literary material</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the extent to which the participants relied on literary or nonliterary texts to support their arguments, the frequency count of material cited in both their MR and LRP shows that Jie and Randy both cited the literary text *Into the Wild* a total of 8 times, while Hyunjin cited the literary text a total of only 3 times in both assignments. In comparison, nonliterary texts were cited a total of 5 times in both of Jie’s papers, 13 times in both of Randy’s assignments, and 9 times in Hyunjin’s assignments. In examining the data in Table 13, it is important to note that while Jie cited the literary text 7 times in the MRP and once in the LRP, the striking difference in the number of citations could be related to the choice of topic in both assignments. Similarly, while Randy did not cite the literary text in his MRP, he cited it 8 times in his LRP, once again possibly due to the nature of his topic in his LRP. Hence, these numbers may not necessarily indicate a marked preference for either type of source text. Again, a likely reason for why certain types of texts were cited more often by participants may have related to the topic of discussion.
they engaged in. This, too, is a useful finding in looking at novice L2 writers’ engagement with research-based writing, as it sheds more light on how they respond to and work with different text types.

Building on the point above, in her MRP, Jie’s topic pertained to the impact of literature on young minds; hence, given the nature of the topic, it was somewhat likely that Jie would have used literary texts to support her argument. Similarly, Randy’s MRP topic was on the significance of mind power in climbing, which was not necessarily related to topics in the literary text, *Into the Wild.* Hence, as a novice academic writer, he may have relied on more information-based texts to support his argument in his MRP. Additionally, given that the MRP was a shorter assignment of about 3 pages and the LRP was a longer research paper that was about 7 pages long, the striking difference in the number of citations could be related to the nature of the assignments. It is important to note however, the context of use in which these participants employed both the literary and nonliterary source texts. The participants wrote for the instructor as the audience and using both types of texts was the requirements of the course. While the participants might have not necessarily wanted to use literary texts in their assignment to support their claims, they might have wanted to meet the expectations of the course to pass the course. Hence, this research setting was a specific context in which they used the literary text which may have had an influence on how they completed the task.

The discussion thus far looked at the two primary research questions and revealed findings relating to the use of literary and nonliterary source-based writing. Drawing
upon these findings, I will now turn to the larger discussion question that motivated this study:

➢ In a course like English for Academic purposes (EAP) which focused on source-based writing, what is the place of literature to teach source-based writing?

The writing course that was the focus of this study introduced students to a rare combination of literary and nonliterary source texts to teach them the complex academic discursive practice of writing from sources; this combination sets it apart from previous studies, which have generally looked at source-based writing using only nonliterary texts. As seen in the aforementioned discussion, while all three participants in the EAP course negotiated elements of source-based writing in different ways that related to their literacy experiences and environmental resources, they seemed to integrate evidence from both literary and nonliterary source texts with apparent ease and fluency and reported no apparent struggle in using either text type to support their argument. Additionally, the participants seemed to show no inclination towards using a specific text type as a source text to support their argument. Interestingly, what this may then suggest is that literature does not seem to be the problem to teach academic writing that many opponents of literature to teach writing may suggest (Coxhead & Byrd, 2007; Horowitz, 1990; Johns, 2003); instead, consistent with several arguments put forth by scholars, the results of this study suggest that literary texts may actually have a place in EAP pedagogy to teach source-based writing.
While the findings in the previous section support extant understandings in the field, an interesting new finding in this study was that the use of a literary text as a source text appeared to enhance student’s creativity in the composition of their text in writing from sources. This finding could be characterized as a grounded theoretical hypothesis and was evident in the ways that elements of creativity were embedded in their composed texts. By creativity, I refer to a new idea or an extant idea contextualized differently or in an unexpected context. In this study, all three participants seemed to demonstrate enhanced creativity in their composed texts through the re-contextualization of information to support their claims and through the use of rhetorical appeals such as ethos, pathos and logos.

Based on the analysis of their written drafts, evidence of creativity was represented differently in each participant’s text. For example, in her Long Research Paper, Hyunjin relied on her status as a Korean student and creatively used culture-specific examples of Korean soldiers to support her claim of whether or not they should be called heroes. In the example below, Hyunjin seemed to integrate knowledge from two domains to construct evidentiary support for her claim. The two domains she used were her native Korean culture and values from the academic culture she was part of. An example of her writing is below:

On March 26th, 2010, a Navy battleship was attacked and 46 soldiers died at sea around Cheonan, South Korea. Among 46 losses, there were soldiers as young as 18 years old or heads of families. In “South Korea mourns victims of warship sinking”, Choe (2010), mentions about how when this incident occurred, the government did not mention any remarks that will give
warnings to North Korea, even if this could be the most serious attack since the Korean War. Although these soldiers died while they were on the duty, because of Korea’s abnormal culture of sympathy and disagreement towards current government, people did not want to accept the reason for their loss. Cultural differences of countries made these 46 soldiers as heroes. Choe also states that these 46 soldiers were honored with military medals that are usually reserved for combat deaths (The New York Times, 2010, para. 5). It is agreeable to be sad and disappointed about the government, but it is disagreeable to award the highest medals to these soldiers. Strangely, there are countless soldiers who fought in the Korean War in 1950’s, and did not receive any medals of honor.

The 46 soldiers should be honored because they are innocent soldiers who were on duty, but even with many combat soldiers who did not get any honor, it is unnecessary for their achievement to get the highest medal. With growing anti-government movement, 46 dead soldiers were able to become heroes and awarded with the highest honor as a soldier. This example clearly shows that different situations can have an influence on how the public decide who can be called as heroes. Both McCandless and 46 soldiers died with braveness, it is different how people address these brave men as heroes or not.

By drawing on her personal culture to support her academic argument, she was able to construct evidence by taking information from one domain and contextualizing slightly differently in another domain. Thus, her choice of example was creative because she integrated the cultural domain with the academic domain to present evidence in a new way. Additionally, her example had ethos pathos and logos that is commonly used in literary texts. For example, because she was raised in the Korean culture, through her example, she showed values of respect for the soldiers and some sense of equality and justice by arguing they should be called heroes. Thus, her text used ethos. Similarly, by raising emotions such as anger, sadness and shame through her example, she appealed to reader’s emotions and thus, her example used pathos. This element of creativity
represented in her written text may have probably been influenced by her reading of the literary text since literary texts are known to use ethos, pathos and logos, thus allowing readers to forge personal connections as they read. Hyunjin’s example used a similar approach.

Similar to the Hyunjin’s example, Jie expressed creativity in her composition by taking advantage of her cultural knowledge, in her Long Research Paper, to describe how heroes are perceived in China. Her creativity was represented by integrating the cultural domain with the academic domain, thus re-contextualizing information and ideas in a new way to present her example. Jie selected a topic that was related to her home culture, that is, she chose to discuss the perception of heroes across different cultures, specifically selecting Chinese and American perspectives. In the example below, Jie used an example from her home culture and integrated it with her academic argument, thus integrating knowledge from two domains to express her creativity:

Individualistic heroism is an important characteristic of an individualist society. Like being discussed in the article, “The Transcendence Zone” by Maria Coffey (2003), the media and public showed their admiration to two great handicapped mountaineers- Tom Whittaker and Erik Weihenmayer generously. Both of them had reached the summit of Everest. The public, especially those people who also had some physical problems with their body, was encouraged and spur by the success of them- the handicapped person could do the thing the ordinary person could do, and even better, because they had to pay more price for it. This was a high respected heroism. In collectivist countries, their deeds have the possibility to be reported, but it would not be a-long-last news and receive so many respects, even be set up as a hero model, because it was only personal achievement. If it happened in China or Japan, the news would fade out quickly. Nevertheless, if it happens in an international competition, and these two alpinists won the prize for their collectivist countries, the situation would turn around.
Since they win the honor for their countries, the media will play up it and lead the trend for sure.

By combining ideas from her home culture to negotiate elements of the writing task in the academic domain, Jie used her creativity to re-contextualize information in a new way. The example she used highlights ethos, specifically because she shares with readers the values and beliefs of the Chinese culture she was raised in. By pointing out what is valued in her culture, she was able to arouse emotions in the reader to denote how personal achievements may be highly valued in an individualistic culture but may not be valued in another culture. Her treatment of the handicapped mountaineer heroes in her example, seem to raise emotions of pity, thus underlying her use of pathos to convince her reader. Literary texts are observed to use similar rhetorical pillars of ethos, pathos and logos to persuade readers and Jie’s strategy of trying to convince her audience through the use of these pillars may have been inspired by her reading of the literary text in the course although there was no direct evidence found in the study to link that.

Similar to Hyunjin and Jie, Randy also expressed creativity in a unique way. In his Long Research Paper, Randy discussed the notion of nature versus nurture to show how risk-taking may be influenced by both environmental and genetic factors. His textual creativity was seen in how he applied psychological evidence to the character in the literary text in order to validate his claims. An example from his text is below:

Nature aspect should be considered to be the main contribution of risk taking character owing to the possibility of DNA distinction in DRD4 (Dopamine Receptor D4) is inheritable. According to Dr. William Dwyer (Appling, 2007), a University of Memphis psychology professor then explains that this kind
of personality derives from heritage of DNA distinction in DRD4 gene, indirectly giving a spirit of having the excitement from adrenaline pumping whenever individuals do these dangerous activities (Appling, 2007, par. 6). His statement clearly claims that some people are naturally born with the enjoyment of fear and thrill so that they are able to comfort their body in danger. Just like drugs, fear and thrill can be an addiction for certain people and inheritable owing to this DNA. A great example showing that this DNA exists, from a 27-year-old former Marine, Jake, who has hobbies in 202 mph-desert-racing and skydiving. He admitted that risky activities are hobbies and crucial part on his life during his tour in Iraq, "No matter how many times you do it, your heart just flutters… even after 105 jumps you still feel the same way each time. It's like after sex. I always need a cigarette." (As cited in Appling, 2007, par. 4). This spirit of risky adventure was also evident in Chris McCandless as he seemed to have the DRD4 gene, a DNA of enjoying the excitement of adrenaline pumping, specifically in adventure. It is apparent when Walt, his father, asked him to join him climbing Longs Peak in Colorado, the peak of Rocky Mountain National Park; Chris was very excited to conquer the top though he was ten years old at that time (Krakauer, 1997, p. 109). His adventure spirit is likely to be derived from his father even though the rest of his families have it, “there was always a little wanderlust in the family, and it was clear early on that Chris had inherited it” (as cited in Krakauer, 1997, p.108). This is the personality specifically deriving from this DNA that made Chris feel the satisfaction of having an adventure by wandering and exploring nature and then obviously lead him into a decision of exploring the wilderness of Alaska despite of the fact that it is dangerous. In short, DNA distinction in DRD4 gene would be the undeniable reason of nature aspect why some people could feel excited whenever they have the enjoyment of adrenaline pumping on their hearts and then breed the tendency of taking risk.

As seen in the above example, Randy’s text expressed creativity through the combination of the psychological and literary domains to validate his claims. Hence, what is creative about his example is that he took information from one context and put it in another. In the example above, he took a character from a literary domain and re-
contextualized it in a psychological domain. Based on my impression as the instructor of the course, due to the fact that students in the course were not taught how to integrate information from various domains, this strategy of re-contextualizing information to convince the reader about his claim could be seen as a creative approach to the construction of his argument. By applying psychological theories to the protagonist in his argument, Randy’s example foregrounded ethos, pathos and logos. His use of ethos in his example could be seen through the use of quotations to demonstrate trustworthiness of the text. Pathos was generated as Randy tried to justify the actions of the protagonist in his example by explaining his actions with the help of psychological theories. His use of logos was represented through the use of psychological theories to convince the reader of the credibility of his claim.

As seen in the examples above, by using the literary text *Into the Wild* as a source text, the participants creatively re-contextualized information from nonliterary texts and their cultural background to justify claims in their composed texts. While expository texts or information-based texts might have provided the participants with direct evidence to support their claims, the literary text seemed to inspire the participants through the use of its rhetorical appeals of ethos, pathos and logos and thereby, enhance the creativity of the participant’s written texts. It is important to note that while Hyunjin explicitly stated in her initial interview with me (May 12, 2010) that for her reading literature creates imagination, there was no direct evidence found in the study that may link Jie’s and Randy’s creativity in their written text to reading literature.
However, it should be noted that the overall positive findings of this study with respect to literature are not being to suggest the sole use of literary texts to teach academic writing to novice multilingual writers, but rather hopes to establish a place for literary texts in an EAP course in order to nourish and enrich the academic literacy skills development that may not be possible with a diet of strictly nonliterary texts. With this caveat in mind, I now turn to the pedagogical implications arising from the study in terms of using literary texts to teach academic writing, including research-based writing.

**Pedagogical Implications**

The findings in this study have several pedagogical implications for L2 writing specialists, especially in the EAP context.

Within the context of L2 writing, while writing from sources is an important learned literacy skill that students need to master (Wette, 2010), the finding points to the pedagogical implication of recognizing the multifaceted and diverse elements that constitute this skill when teaching source-based writing. By understanding the complex nature of source-based writing, EAP educators and researchers can reduce this complexity in their course assignments by breaking down the elements of the task into simplified and manageable tasks for multilingual academic writers. This would allow for instructional scaffolding at crucial stages of the writing process in the form of providing specific prompts, graphic organizers or models, and feedback on the various components of source-based writing which would help facilitate the task for novice multilingual academic writers.
In looking at this study, it is important to evaluate the nature of written assignments in an EAP course when teaching source-based writing. Specifically, in this study, the course used the Mini (MRP) and the Long Research Paper (LRP), in addition to response and summary papers. Based on the findings, while the multiple response papers were noticeably useful to students in that it seemed to scaffold their writing of the more complex tasks, positioning the MR and LRP as two separate unrelated assignments may not be recommended. Instead, using the MRP as a prelude to the LRP, and not as an individual research paper in itself, would allow students to work on the same research paper topic throughout the course of the semester, thus developing, modifying and refining it as they learned new discourse components in the course. This would give students a chance to critically apply the skills and knowledge learned in the course while teaching them the importance of writing in drafts.

An important feature of this study entailed the use of literary and nonliterary source texts to teach source-based writing. While most EAP courses tend to use nonliterary texts to teach academic writing, this study differed largely in that it introduced novice multilingual writers to a literary source text. Hence, an important implication arising from the study is that the use of literature to teach writing from sources in an EAP course may have several advantages, especially for multilingual students, since personal engagement with reading and writing about the text may be a source of empowerment in their development as academic readers and writers (Blanton, 1994).

If using a literature-based approach to teaching writing from sources, based on experiences found in this study, it is important to focus on using literature in an integrated
reading-writing context. What this means, then, is that in order for literature to be meaningful in an EAP course, substantive activities in the form of integrated reading-writing activities are essential to developing the academic literacy skills of students. Specifically in this study, the participants wrote six response papers to the literary text *Into the Wild* and were expected to use the literary text as a source in their research papers. The response papers seemed to provide the multilingual writers with extensive opportunities to read and reflect and, consequently, seemed to help the development of their critical and analytical writing skills. Not only that, within the context of research-based writing, the response papers introduced them to an integration and discussion of source material which allowed them to merge their position on the topic and accordingly facilitate their navigation of the MR and LRP. Hence, in a way, writing response papers to the literary text seemed to prepare the participants for elements of research-based writing. Several scholars have advocated for the use of response-related activities to literature. Hirvela’s (2001) research showed students’ preference for writing response papers among other assignments. Moreover, Takagaki (2002) suggests teaching literature in connection with the human experience because it allows students to make connections between the text world and real world, which could be done through writing response papers. Salvatori’s (1996) pedagogy of literature-reading-writing proposes writing informal personal responses, reflective commentary on reader moves, and a formal paper on analysis of the text. Her proposed pedagogy, which is reflective of Bleich’s (1978) response heuristic and response statements, underscores the point that writing responses to texts unravels the reader’s complications with the text. Not only that, he says “it
heightens their awareness of how they read and experience writing as a part of their reading” (cited in Belcher & Hirvela, 2001 p.123). Additionally, Vandrick (1996), who advocates using multicultural literature in ESL classrooms, states that “often, writing in journals or writing short response papers after reading and discussing the literature helps students to process both the universalities and the differences in their own ways, at the levels they are ready to absorb these concepts” (p.264). All these studies point to the effectiveness of shaping writing activities to allow students to engage in deeper and meaningful interactions with the text and highlight an important pedagogical implication of making literature an enjoyable and meaningful experience for novice multilingual writers in an EAP course.

Based on this study, although it is clear that literature has something special to offer novice multilingual writers in an EAP course, perhaps when teaching source-based writing, it may be feasible to expose students to a variety of source texts types. This study looked at the use of a nonfictional text, Into the Wild, as a literary source text and the nonfictional characteristic of the text contributed a real-life element to the story which added to the students’ engagement with the text. Selection of texts to teach source-based writing for novice multilingual writers can be a highly complex task for instructors and educators in EAP. Not only should source texts be aesthetically appealing to students, but they should also be valuable to EAP students in terms of offering academic input. A pedagogical implication of this study is that using a broad range of text types and rhetorical styles can expose students to a wide array of genres and provide opportunities to engage in “critical thinking” (Gajdusek & van Dommelen, 1993) while offering a
balance of text types. Especially, novice multilingual writers with limited academic reading and writing experience in English may benefit from this variation.

**Contributions of the Study**

Building on the answers it produced to its research questions, this study has made a number of contributions to our understanding of EAP instruction and source-based writing pedagogy. The primary contribution is in addressing a topic of importance in the L2 writing field from an angle which has received little attention in the scholarly literature, and in doing so, the study has expanded the boundaries of L2 writing scholarship.

With reference to the first point, few studies have discussed the use of literature to teach source-based writing, and even fewer have looked at the combination of literary and nonliterary texts employed in this study’s research site. Hence, a unique feature of this study in terms of its contribution to the field of second language writing has to do with the nature of this study. As mentioned previously, the course explored in this study used a rare combination of literary and nonliterary source texts to teach them the complex academic discursive practice of writing from sources; this combination sets it apart from previous studies, which have generally looked at source-based writing using only nonliterary texts. Thus, it sheds light on an important but under-examined dimension of research-based writing instruction. Examining novice multilingual academic writer’s perceptions and uses of literary texts and nonliterary source texts has allowed us to gain insights into some of the challenges and opportunities they face in using sources and have shed light on how novice writers may appropriate textual practices. Additionally, the
study provides an increased understanding of the complexities involved in learning multifaceted academic discursive practices and accordingly provide instructional scaffolding and intervention at crucial stages of the writing process. Ultimately, then, the study has contributed new knowledge to the ongoing debate about the use of literary texts in research-based EAP writing instruction.

Moreover, the study has made a substantive new contribution to the field by enhancing what we already know about source-based writing. By using a literary text as a source text in the writing course, the study was able to show how literary texts appear to enhance creativity in the participant’s composed text in writing from sources. By recontextualizing information from one domain to another in order to justify their claims, the participants demonstrated enhanced creativity in crafting their written text which may have been inspired by their reading of the literary text. Hence, in viewing this contribution as a grounded theoretical hypothesis, the study extended our understanding and knowledge of using literary texts as source texts.

**Directions for Future Research**

In order to provide further insights into how novice academic multilingual writers compose from source texts that include a variety of literary and nonliterary sources, several areas in academic literacy research need to be further explored. This study used only one literary text, in addition to other information-based texts, in order to examine how three first novice writers navigated source-based writing and respond to these source texts. Perhaps future research could use multiple literary texts, such as short stories,
instead of one novel or nonfictional literary text to teach source-based writing and examine how students would respond to these shorter texts. Future studies could also examine crucial questions of what influences students to choose one source text over another, or if certain text types appeal to novice multilingual students more than others, or if length of texts impact their choices. All these outcomes would yield interesting insights into how and why multilingual writers use certain source texts and how these choices may impact their writing.

Although this study took into account the participants’ reading practices and found that within the framework of reading and writing connections, their reading may have impacted their writing from sources in many ways, perhaps future research could explore in more detail the related reading processes that influence the process of writing from multiple sources. Especially within an L2 context, multilingual novice writers have varying amounts of exposure to texts and experience a wide range of reading issues related to vocabulary, syntax, and cultural knowledge. Hence, they bring to the writing process a variety of skills and knowledge that need to be accounted for in writing research. Investigating these reading practices could provide significant insights into why novice multilingual writers may struggle with specific elements of writing from sources, such as researching sources, and whether their reading proficiency possibly impacts their ability to extract information from sources and perform transformation of source content operations. It should also be noted that this study did not measure students’ actual reading proficiency or comprehension of the source texts used. This limited the claims that could be made about the students as readers. Future studies could include reading-
related measures that would enrich understanding of the reading domain of integrated reading-writing activity.

Looking at future research from another direction, this study drew on formulations from Vygotksy’s sociocultural theory of mediation as extended by Lantolf (2000) to make sense of the data; hence, it used a specific angle to analyze data. Perhaps a different framework or lens would yield different findings. The sociocultural perspective of mediation theory highlighted how semiotic resources available in the social context may mediate learning. Further research may investigate source-based writing from a constructivist perspective or alternate perspectives to understand how novice multilingual students understand and perceive the task of writing from sources, and how this impacts the actual task of constructing from sources. Moreover, within this framework, research could take an in-depth look into how multilingual students construct meaning from sources to compose new texts.

Another fruitful line of research concerns multilingual student’s awareness of common knowledge in research-based writing. While the current study briefly touched on the subject of multilingual students’ common knowledge and, future research could explore how novice multilingual writers respond to the ambiguity of what constitutes common knowledge and how this may impact their writing. One related question could be: how do they respond to challenging practices in academic literacy, such as the blurry concept of common knowledge when writing from sources?
Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, this study investigated how three novice academic multilingual writers navigated the academic discursive practice of literary and nonliterary research-based writing and negotiated elements of this complex discursive practice. The study found that each writer navigated the practice of source-based writing differently by interacting with mediating semiotic resources in their social context. The findings in this study highlight the agentive approach that the participants used to make sense of the complex practice of research-based writing and how they afforded resources in some instances and self-scaffolded their learning in other instances. Additionally, the study uncovered several challenges these novice writers encountered while attempting to learn the practice of source-based writing, and hopes to shed light on the possibility for a scaffolded instructional approach to teaching this complex discursive practice. More importantly, a substantive new finding contributed by this study was related to the use of a literary text to enhance student’s creativity in the composition of their own text in writing from sources. While the study only scratched the surface of the participant’s journey in learning to use sources, it provides useful information for EAP professionals and stimulates future research on multilingual students’ use of source texts that may enrich EAP pedagogies.
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APPENDIX A
Participant Recruitment Letter

Dear Participant,

I am a PhD candidate in the Foreign and Second Language Education Program and would like to conduct a study on the academic discursive practices of second language writers in an English for Academic Purposes writing course. As a teacher of the 108.01 course for the past 2 years, I have selected my 108.01 classroom as my dissertation research site since it represents the population of students that suits my research interest i.e. undergraduate second language writers. The purpose of this research is to collect data for my dissertation on how second language writers navigate the academic literacy practices of learning disciplinary writing; specifically related to source-based writing.

The study will be conducted for one quarter during Spring 2010 in the 108.01 course. For this purpose, if you grant me permission by participating in this research, I will videotape our class sessions and will audio-record tutorial sessions with you. The video recording is to enable me to review instructional content at the time of analysis and the audio-recording is for me to record our discussions on your written drafts to learn more about your perceptions towards source texts and document the process involved in integrating source texts into your writing. During the tutorial session, I will conduct some interviews in reference to your draft, which will mostly be in the form of a discussion of your draft. The goal of this research is to explore how undergraduate second language writers (L2) respond to source text types in the process of learning academic literacy. Hence, I will need to collect and photocopy your written drafts after they have been graded. During class sessions and during tutorials, I will be making field notes for myself to help me at the time of analysis. I will hand out a literature-based survey to be completed electronically at your convenience at the end of the course.

If you agree to participate, I will have you sign an informed consent form. Any information gathered during the process of this research will be kept confidential. If you have any further questions about this research, please do not hesitate to contact me at -----

Thank you for your participation
APPENDIX B
Consent for Participation in Research

Protocol Title: 

Protocol Number: 

Principal Investigators: 

Co-investigator: 

Purpose: The purpose of this research is to collect data for my doctoral dissertation in foreign and second language education. The present study seeks to investigate discursive practices of second language undergraduate writers by examining how they respond to source texts types, specifically literary texts, to compose their own writing and to determine the suitability (or lack thereof) of using literary texts to teach academic writing.

Procedure: This study will be conducted for one quarter during Spring 2010 in the 108.01 course. For this purpose, if you grant me permission by participating in this research, I will videotape our class sessions starting the second week of the quarter and will audio-record tutorial sessions with you. The video recording is to enable to analyze classroom discussions on source texts and the audio-recording is for me to learn more about your perceptions towards source texts and document the process involved in integrating source texts into your writing. During the tutorial session, I will conduct some interviews in reference to your draft, which will mostly be in the form of a discussion of your draft. The goal of this research is to explore how undergraduate second language writers (L2) respond to literary texts as source texts in the process of learning academic writing. Hence, I will need to collect and analyze your written drafts after they have been graded. Once I find some preliminary observations, I will invite you to schedule a 15-minute interview to cross check my findings with you. During class sessions and during tutorials, I will be making field notes for myself to help me at the time of analysis. I will hand out a literature-based survey to be completed electronically at your convenience at the end of the course.

Confidentiality: The information that you provide will be kept confidential. No items from the interviews or video recordings of the tutorial discourse will be used if they identify the participants. You will only be identified by a pseudonym that you choose.

Refusals: Your participation in this study is voluntary. Therefore, you have all the rights to refuse to answer the questions that you do not wish to answer or withdraw from this study at any time.

Inquiries: Should you have any questions or concerns about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at ----------- or my advisor at --------------
I consent to participating in research entitled: ________________________________

**Faye D’Silva, Co-investigator,** has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described, as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available. I know that I can choose not to participate without penalty. I also understand that my participation will not affect my grades and success in the program. I consent to the use of audiotapes and videotapes. I understand how the tapes will be used for this study. I also consent to the use of my journals and classroom assignments.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: 

Signed: 

__________________________________

*(Participant)*

Signed: 

__________________________________

*(Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative)*

Signed: 

__________________________________

*(Person authorized to consent for participant, if required)*

Witness: 

__________________________________
APPENDIX C
Participant Recruitment Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect as much background information as I can from my students to facilitate the process of purposeful sampling.

1. Please select your gender
2. Major subject (e.g. Business)
3. Please name the country you are from
4. What is your native language?
5. Number of novels you read in English until now
6. Do you enjoy reading literature/novels in English?
7. Do you enjoy reading literature/novels in your native language?
8. Do you believe that reading literature can help improve your English?
9. Do you believe that reading literature can help improve your writing?
10. Do you think English literature/novels are too difficult for non-native speakers of English?
11. What do you think is an advantage or disadvantage of reading literature/novels?
APPENDIX D
Sample Structured Journal

Name:

Date:

These are some options you may consider while writing in your journal. There is no word or page limit, no structure- feel to express your ideas without concern about perfect grammar or sentences.

In your opinion, what is academic writing? Have you written academically before? How is it different from any other writing? Any examples?

What are your thoughts on the book, Into the wild, so far and the article “Adventurers change”? What are some thoughts you have while reading the book? Are you able to get all the assigned pages done? Feel free to write whatever you please in relation to this.
APPENDIX E
Sample Interview Questions

1. How much time did you spend on this assignment?
2. How much time did you spend on reading Into the Wild?
3. Do you enjoy reading Into the Wild? What about the other articles in the course?
4. Do you think the literary text is difficult for non-native speakers of English?
5. What difficulties or challenges did you face most while writing this assignment?
6. What would you like to work on during this conference?
7. Did you face any problems with integrating the source into your own text? If yes, tell me more, if no, tell me why.
8. Why did you cite the source here? Why did you choose this source? Where did you find this source?
9. What is your perception of a source text? How would you define it?
10. How would you define a literary text? Do you enjoy reading literature?
11. Why do think we use sources in writing?
12. How would you define academic writing?
13. What is the most important thing you focus on while writing papers in English? (e.g. grammar, organization, mechanics, voice)
14. Have you written source–based papers before?
15. What has been your experience with reading source texts so far?
16. What has been your experience with constructing arguments using sources?
17. Do you find sources easily? Where do you generally look for sources? Why?
18. Tell me about your experience writing this paper
19. Why did you choose this source instead of another source?
20. What do you think are some challenges you faced in this assignment?
21. Were you able to understand what was explained in class on this topic?
22. Did you find the library lecture session useful?
APPENDIX F
Data Codes

Categories are represented by the bolded words and the codes are represented within these categories.

**Background** - previous literacy experiences, reading and writing in their native language,

**Academic experiences** – reading at the university, writing at the university, navigating current tasks, reading processes, learning experiences

**Challenges**- vocabulary, grammar, reading speed, time management, finding sources, using citations, using formal register in writing, applying course knowledge to writing, reading complex texts in other courses, organization of ideas, topic sentences, connecting links, using the library, limited text experience, understanding academic writing, writing response papers, language issues

**Writing**- integrating sources, summarizing, paraphrasing, using quotations, sense of audience, definition of academic writing, outlines, less time on planning paper, summary skills, argumentative writing and structure, writing in drafts, extracting evidence, discussion of claim, connecting explanation, self critical, choice of topic, planning paper, new genre, novice writer, connection between ideas, tying together ideas, linking words, organization.

**Response to literary text**- passionate, previous experience, schema, personal connection, judgmental, evaluative, vocabulary, , author-focused, source text, sympathy, dual purpose for reading, opinion of book, reading strategy, guessing meaning

**Scaffolding**- Response papers, MRP, mediating artifacts, mediating sources,

**Instruction**- classroom discourse, feedback, course concepts, revision, drafts, using feedback in paper, tutorial conversation, peer reviews, in-class discussion, participation

**Attitude and motivation:** motivated, lack of interest, did not incorporate instructor feedback, did follow course instruction, late submission of assignment, completion of assigned readings, participation in class, distractions, social media, language issue interference, use of strategies, appreciation for learning and instruction, excitement about assignments.

**Skills** – use of strategies, planning in advance, conceptualizing paper, discerning sources, choice of sources, discourse components discussion, appropriate use of citations, building argument, clear connection between ideas, logical progression of ideas, explanation of evidence, self-scaffold, used resources, sought instructor intervention, self reflection

**Variation in practices**- comparison of home country writing requirements, linguistic differences, cultural difference, academic tone, assignment requirements, differences in writing rules, textual appropriation and citation, role of instructor, organization
APPENDIX G
Outline for The Mini Research Paper

Please fill out the following outline with the elements of your mini research paper essay

1) What is your research question? ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________

2) How is this subject relevant to the theme of the course “Adventure & Risk-taking”?
   ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________

3) State your thesis statement: ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________

4) What topics will you discuss in this paper (related to your thesis statement):
   Topic 1 ____________________________________________ pp#________
   
   Give an example or supporting evidence from the book: _________________________
   
   ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________
   
   How is this example important to your paper? _________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________
   
   ____________________________________________
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Topic 2

Give an example or supporting evidence from the book:

How is this example important to your paper?

Topic 3

Give an example or supporting evidence from the book:

How is this example important to your paper?